Policy and practice: Design education in England from 1837-1992, with particular reference to furniture courses at Birmingham, Leicester and the Royal College of Art.

Deborah Jewison

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at De Montfort University

March 2015

De Montfort University, Leicester

Abstract

This thesis is an examination of policy-making and practice in design education in England from 1837-1992. It takes a *longue durée* approach to the history of the development of design education to provide a new narrative which shows a pattern of recurring debates concerning the purpose of design education and how it should be taught. Using the curricula of furniture design courses at three art schools to illustrate the way policy was put into practice, this thesis argues that historical context is key to understanding why debates regarding the way designers should be trained for industry have recurred since 1837. Based on a wide variety of primary source material the thesis contributes to historiography by extending the scope of previous histories of art and design education, and also, for the first time, focuses solely on the development of design education, whilst acknowledging its place in the wider development of art and design education.

Following the introduction, chapter two of this thesis examines the events which led to the 1835-6 Select Committee and argues that many of the issues raised during the Committee influenced the teaching of design education through the remainder of the nineteenth century; this is further demonstrated through chapter three. Charting the development of design education into the twentieth century through chapters four, five and six, this thesis shows that changing historical contexts, such as the development of industrial methods or wider changes in higher education, have also had an impact on design education. In the light of changing historical contexts, policy makers for design education have continually questioned what design students should be taught and how they should be taught, which accounts, in part, for the recurring nature of debates in design education.

Contents

Chapter three: The schools of design from 1837- 1910

Chapter four: The beginnings of reorganisation: the 1930s

Chapter five: A return to design focussed education: 1946 – 1967

Chapter six: The end of the art schools: 1967 - 1992

Acknowledgments

Firstly, thanks are due to my supervisors Dr Tina Barnes-Powell, Dr Christine Boydell and Stuart Lawson for their support, advice and constructive criticism through the process of writing this thesis.

Thanks are also due to the staff at the various archives: Linda Butt and Katharine Short, archivists at De Montfort University; Fiona Waterhouse, Steven Homer and Frances Pond, archivist and record managers at Birmingham City University; the staff at the Royal College of Art archives; the V&A Archive of Art and Design; the National Archive; the British Library; the National Art Library; Buckinghamshire Chilterns New University and Wycombe Museum.

Undertaking a self-funded PhD is not an easy task, and my thanks must also go to the Royal Historical Society, the Economic History Society and De Montfort University for awarding me research grants which enabled me to spend time at various archives and libraries in London.

On a more personal note, I have also to thank Francesca for her encouragement and suggestions at the start of this process. My biggest thanks, however, are to Elaine; she has lived with this thesis for as long as I have, and I am hugely grateful to her for her belief that I could complete this PhD, her advice and support, and her proof-reading.

List of abbreviations

ARCA	Associate of the Royal College of Art
CNAA	Council for National Academic Awards
CIA	Council for Art and Industry
CoID	Council of Industrial Design
BCU	Birmingham City University
D&DI	*Design and the Designer in Industry* report
Dip A.D	Diploma in Art and Design
DMU	De Montfort University
NACAEd	National Advisory Council on Art Education
NACAEx	National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations
NCDAD	National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design
NDD	National Diploma in Design
RA	Royal Academy
RCA	Royal College of Art
RSA	Royal Society of Arts
SIA	Society of Industrial Artists

Three art schools are used as case studies in this thesis; they are now known as the Royal College of Art, Birmingham City University and De Montfort University. Their names have changed several times between 1837 and 1992, and for the sake of consistency and to avoid confusion for the reader the following conventions will be used through this thesis:
The Royal College of Art is referred to as the School of Design in chapters two and three. From chapter four onwards, Royal College of Art or RCA is used.
Birmingham City University and De Montfort University are referred to as 'art schools' throughout: for example, 'Leicester's art school' or 'the art school in Birmingham' or 'Birmingham school of art'. The exception to this is in the chapter three subheadings describing their foundation; the correct name of the school at the time of its foundation is used.

Where the lower case 'school(s) of design' is used, this refers to a school of design that is not the Government School of Design, or to schools of design collectively.
A list of the name changes of the art schools is provided in appendix 1.

Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Overview and methodology

The impetus for this thesis arose from an interest in the relationship between design and industry; particularly the training that design students received at art schools and universities during the twentieth century. Initial reading on the subject of design education revealed that the issues of what design students should be taught in order that their qualifications were relevant to industry, and how they should be taught, recurred over time, with no apparent resolution. This led to the question of why these issues were such an evident constant within debates on design education: were art schools persistently failing to teach relevant courses; or were manufacturers and industrialists expecting too much of art schools in the regards to the training they could reasonably be expected to provide? In addition, the views of governments, manufacturers and industrialists regarding the purpose and role of art schools were also of interest.

In some respects, debates about a particular subject, what it should teach, and how, are not unusual within academic or educational fields; notions about education change over time, and curricula are updated and restructured to keep subjects contemporary and relevant. Within design education, however, debates regarding what design students should be taught have been noticeably cyclical and have persisted since 1837, seemingly without resolution. This thesis builds on several areas of existing scholarship and, employing alongside that scholarship significant tracts of hitherto little used primary source material, attempts to explain why this discourse has been so persistent and tending to echo the very same issues from generation to generation. It takes a *longue durée* approach to the history of the development of design education, which not only allows the cyclical nature of debates to be clearly seen, but also reveals that design education as a discipline has been particularly sensitive to the historical context within which it was operating. This thesis argues that these changing historical contexts have led to discrepancies and tensions between policy and practice since 1837. By ‘policy’ is here meant ideas about what design is, and what good design education should be, including views from governmental bodies and those within the discipline; by ‘practice’

is meant what was actually happening on the ground, illustrated here in local case studies from London, Birmingham and Leicester. The tensions and mismatches between policy and practice have been repeated as historical contexts have changed, resulting in numerous policy recommendations and directives, evidenced by the wealth of primary source material used in this thesis concerning policy on design education. In addition, the complexities involved in delivering design education, not least the changing needs of stakeholders (students, employers, governments), and the physical requirements of the discipline (work space, machinery, equipment, materials), have meant that responses to policy recommendations have been inconsistent and fitful; this is also revealed through the thesis.

The benefits of using an historical approach have been recognised by scholars such as Hill and Kerber who noted that it both throws light on present and future trends, and enables solutions to current problems to be sought in the past.[1] More specifically regarding historical research within education Cohen has commented that: '…the historical study of an educational idea or institution can do much to help us understand how our present educational system has come about; and this kind of understanding can in turn help to establish a sound basis for further progress or change.'[2] In offering a picture of the changing contexts within which art and design education developed and policy was made, it is possible to understand why the nature of debate on design education curricula has been cyclical and seemingly unresolved. As this thesis ends its scope in 1992, it does not offer concrete solutions for the future direction of design education, though some thoughts are laid out in the conclusion; a study of design education post-1992 together with this work would present a more solid foundation from which to make those suggestions. Rather, this thesis contributes the first full narrative of the development of key aspects of design education in England between 1837 and 1992, with particular reference to art schools in London, Birmingham and Leicester, revealing for the first time the continuing cyclical nature of debates on design education and the historical contexts within which those debates took place. As such it

[1] L. Cohen *et al. Research Methods in Education* (Oxon, 2008) p. 191.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 191-2.

offers a first step to beginning the task of understanding and explaining the tensions between policy and practice in the subject.[3]

There are various ways in which the charting of the development of art and design education might be approached: possible methodologies include an institutional approach by exploring the founding and expansion of art schools around the country or by further case studies of individual art schools; a geographical approach through examination of a particular region, its industries, and the extent to which the local art school(s) may have contributed to local industries in providing training for workers and designers; an industrial approach involving examination of a particular industry such as textiles or ceramics and the way in which art school education has trained students for this and the skills that students require to work in such an industry; or by examining the careers of individual artists, designers and educationalists who have helped to shape design education in particular ways.[4] These would all be fruitful in their own way; however this thesis offers a new approach in tracing the development of design education through an historical examination of policy in reports and papers produced both by the government and by national bodies overseeing design education or with a strong interest in design. More specifically, this thesis examines the development of policy regarding art school curricula – the skills and knowledge that it was felt students required in order that they might secure jobs in industry after leaving art school. The majority of reports set out only recommendations in this regard, but as such these

[3] There have been several works outlining the history of the development of art and design education, most notably those by Quentin Bell, Edward Bird, Peter Cunningham, and Mervyn Romans. However, these are restricted in coverage to the nineteenth century, the early years of design education, and thus there is a significant gap in scholarship in the continuation of the history of the development of design education into the twentieth century. Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963); E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century*, (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology, 1992); P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979); M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid- Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Central England, 1998).

[4] Stuart Macdonald's recent work *A Century of Art and Design Education* is an example of the latter means of documenting the history of art and design education. Macdonald examines the development of art and design education during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries through the example of several art and design teachers: Walter Crane, Charles Ashbee, William Lethaby, Robert Catterson-Smith, Fred Burridge and Fra Newberry. See. S. Macdonald *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art* (Cambridge, 2005).

reports provide a way of tracing the intentions of those overseeing art and design education as to what they wanted art schools to teach and students to learn.

1.2 The case study method

Whilst an examination of policy on design education *per se* may be useful, it is, however, almost meaningless if unaccompanied by at least glimpses of its impact in practice in art schools. Therefore, three art schools were chosen as case studies in order to provide those glimpses of reception; Birmingham City University, De Montfort University and the Royal College of Art. Their histories are outlined briefly later in the thesis, but the primary purpose of their inclusion in this study is to provide a framework within which to place the policies made over time. It is by providing 'real life' examples of the ways in which policy was put into practice – or not - that we begin to see discrepancies and tensions that have occurred as a result of the changing historical contexts within which design education developed.

The design subjects taught in these art schools were many and varied, and examining all of them in relation to policy on art and design curricula would be far too large a task for a thesis, and result in a rather superficial study. For the specific examination of practice in art schools, the subject of furniture design has been chosen as a case study. Many of the recommendations made in reports regarding design education cover a variety of skills which students training at art schools were thought to require: these include drawing, craftsmanship, technical knowledge, knowledge of materials, experience of production methods, to give but some examples. Furniture design is a subject that encompasses all of these and thus makes it a particularly useful subject for a case study. Additionally, changes in the production processes, technology and materials used in furniture manufacturing which took place during the period covered by this thesis impacted especially strongly on policy regarding curricula and thus on the teaching at art schools.

1.3 The Royal College of Art

The Royal College of Art (hereafter RCA) was initially chosen for inclusion in this study as it was the first school of design in England, set up as the Government School of Design in 1837 following the recommendations of the 1835-6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures. When it was founded, the Royal College of Art was intended as the 'head' school of the art and design education system, with all branch schools initially following the same curriculum as that taught at the London school. The College eventually became a post-graduate institution offering advanced work – effectively the apex of art and design education - and policy on art and design education often included the College due to its position within the overall system of art and design education. Because of this, and the fact that its history is so intertwined with the development of art and design education, the Royal College of Art has been included in this thesis.

The early history of the RCA is essentially also the history of the development of design education, as decisions made regarding the College affected all the branch schools. Fifty-nine Command Papers and Select Committee reports between 1837 and 1899 make up the primary source material on the early history of the College, and on the history of design education, and several of these were examined for this thesis.[5] The

[5] Primary sources for the early history of the RCA are: School of Design *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere MP President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design* (1841); *Report of the Council of the School of Design, 1842-3* (1843); *Third report of the council of the School of Design for the year 1843-4* (1844); *Fourth report of the council of the School of Design for the year 1844-45* (1845); *Fifth report of the council of the School of Design for the year 1845-46* (1846); *Report of a Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design* (1847); *Report of the Second Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design* (1847); *Report from the Select Committee of the School of Design together with Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1849); Schools of Design *Copies of all Reports on the State of the Head or Provincial Schools made to the Board of Trade since August 1849* (1850); Schools of Design *Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head and Branch Schools of Design during the last Twelve Months* (1850); *Reports and Documents exhibiting the state and progress of the Head and Branch Schools of Design in the year 1850-51* (1851); *First report of the Department of Practical Art 1852-3* (1853). Between 1853 and 1859, yearly reports on the School were published as the First to Sixth *report of the Department of Science and Art.* From 1860 -1899 these became the Seventh – Forty Sixth *report of the Science and Art Department of the Committee of Council on Education.* Secondary sources on the development of design education include E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century*, (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology, 1992); P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979); C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: 150 years of Art and Design* (London 1987); M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the*

Select Committee report of 1836 is perhaps the most important, as it is in this document that the multiplicity of issues contributing to the decision to found the College are revealed. Both the questions asked and the answers given during Committee sessions indicate the issues regarding art and design that were of concern at the time, and thus the Select Committee report is crucial for an understanding of the context within which the School of Design was founded. The RCA itself has a substantial archive of material, most of which dates from 1896, when the National Art Training School was renamed as the Royal College of Art. Material includes minute books, press cuttings, annual reports and a large photographic record of the School and student work. There is also a complete run of prospectuses starting in 1926, which were consulted during the course of my research; prospectuses prior to 1926 are not available, although the earlier history of the RCA has been well documented via the primary sources outlined above. The National Archives also hold numerous documents and files on the RCA dating, in the main, from 1837 - c1965; the files ED 165/95-126 constitute the bulk of these, dating from 1949 to 1965. Much of the material is not concerned with curricula of the College; it pertains to more general information regarding the running of the College such as teachers' salaries, funds for building repair, catering, ministerial visits, and correspondence. File ED 165/111 (1957-8) does contain some informative material regarding the jobs students gained when the left the College, but there is not a great deal regarding curricula.

There have been more secondary works written documenting the history of the Royal College of Art than other art schools, probably because of its prominence in terms of art and design. It also has an extensive archive of material of its history, and, due to its status as 'head' of the art school system in the UK, has been documented from other points of view as well, notably government and official sources; therefore information on the College is relatively easy to source. Aspects of the College have been fairly well documented over the years, from more general histories of the institution to histories of specific subjects or periods in time.[6] Hilary Cunliffe-Charlesworth's 1991 thesis is one

---

History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Central England, 1998).

[6] For example: S. Bayley & G. Chapman *Moving Objects: 30 years of Vehicle Design at the Royal College of Art* (1999); P. Huxley *Painters at the Royal College of Art* (1988); R. Woof *Artist as Evacuee:*

such example of the latter; it focuses on the Royal College of Art from 1900-1950 and explores the training of art teachers and the teaching of art and design at the College to determine the extent of the College's influence on art, design and education more widely during this period.[7] Cunliffe-Charlesworth's thesis also examines the relationship of the College to government and the influence of government on College policy. Early research for her thesis formed the basis for parts of former RCA lecturer Christopher Frayling's 1987 book *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred Years of Art and Design*, written when Frayling was Professor of Cultural History at the RCA. His work is a more general, though nevertheless very informative overview of the history of the College from its beginnings up to 1987. However, both Cunliffe-Charlesworth's and Frayling's work provide little information about specific curricula and subjects taught, though the few references there are have nonetheless been useful in helping piece to together a picture of teaching at the College.

1.4 Birmingham City University

Birmingham's rich industrial history and large art school made it a natural choice for inclusion in this thesis. The Birmingham Government School of Design was founded in 1843 out of the Society of Arts in Birmingham and soon grew into a large and well-regarded art school.[8] In 1884 it became the first Municipal school of art in the country and over time various branch and junior schools opened, supporting the work of the main art school in the city centre. In the late nineteenth century teaching at the school was strongly influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement, and the School tried to move away from the 23-stage National Curriculum for art set out by Henry Cole and Richard

---

The Royal College of Art in the Lake District 1940-1945 (Grasmere, 1987). Other works documenting the College and aspects of its history include C. Frayling *Design of the Times: One hundred years of the Royal College of Art* (London, 1996) and F. MacCarthy *The Perfect Place to Grow: 175 years of the Royal College of Art* (London, 2012).

[7] H. Cunliffe-Charlesworth *The Royal College of Art: Its Influence on Education, Art and Design 1900-1950* (unpublished PhD thesis: Sheffield City Polytechnic, 1991).

[8] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 241; *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6* (1846) p. 19.

Redgrave and which is examined in more detail in chapter two.[9] This curriculum was followed by all art schools, though Birmingham's art school steered towards more practical work, and by the 1890s there were a variety of practical classes held at the School, and as Swift notes, 'although Birmingham continued to build on its reputation for practical designing, some other schools of art had rapidly followed suit, e.g., the Central School in London and Leicester School of Art, and by the second decade of the new century most schools had opened practical workshops for designing'.[10] Birmingham's art school, therefore, was one of the first to introduce practical classes in addition to designing on paper, perhaps realising that this would be more relevant to work that students would be doing in their employment. The School continued to develop new classes and departments; in 1933 a School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship had been set up and ran a course, which, it was claimed, was tailored to the needs of local businesses, and took the form of an experimental workshop.[11] In 1937 Pevsner described Birmingham's provision for art education as one of the most complete systems in the country, and by the late 1960s the art school was one of the largest in Britain.[12]

Birmingham City University has a substantial archive of material covering the period from c1820-1970, including minute books, prospectuses, photographs and designs of students work and student registers. Prospectuses for the period after 1970-1 are held in the University's Modern Records Office. The University's collection of prospectuses was consulted for this thesis, as were several files on Birmingham School of Art held at The National Archives. Files ED 167/265, ED 165/266 and ED 165/267 dating from 1945 - 1967 contain a variety of material – correspondence, course submissions, information regarding the general running of the school – and some of the correspondence and course submission documents have been particularly useful for this thesis.

[9] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 78.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 81.
[11] *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-37,* p. 22.
[12] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 139.

In terms of secondary literature, Peter Cunningham's thesis *The Formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850 with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* incorporates the only history of the founding of Birmingham's art school. Although part of a wider thesis examining local differences in the reasons behind the founding of art schools, it is nevertheless a useful resource concerning the origins of Birmingham's art school. Particularly telling is that Cunningham notes local influences as instrumental to the founding of regional art schools, so Birmingham's history is examined from a local level, although this is considered within the context of the development of art and design education nationally. Other information regarding Birmingham's early history can be gleaned from sources such as Tilson's edited volume *Made in Birmingham: Design and Industry 1889-1989* which includes a chapter on the School of Art by John Swift, covering the period 1880-1900 and focusing on the branch schools and female students particularly, but which provides useful information regarding the art school at that time.[13] Swift was at one time keeper of the School of Art Archives at Birmingham City University, and he has done much research into aspects of art and design education in Birmingham. Two of his essays are also included in a 2005 volume edited by Romans entitled *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*.[14] The first of these 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' is an excellent summary of the history of Birmingham's art school which argues that far from being under the strict control of the national system of art education as dictated from London, those at Birmingham's art school found ways to move outside of this control and serve the needs of its locality more fully and develop more of an Arts and Crafts emphasis.[15] Swift's second essay covers the same period as the first, but focuses on women within the art schools system in Birmingham, examining the attitudes and policies towards women as both staff and students of the schools.[16] All of

[13] J. Swift 'Birmingham Art School: Its Branch Schools and Female Students 1880-1900' in B. Tilson (Ed) *Made in Birmingham: Design and Industry 1889-1989* (Studley, 1989) pp. 49-64. Barbara Tilson became a freelance researcher and writer in design, architecture and industry after lecturing in design history. In 1992 she received her doctorate on the study of plastics design, manufacture and usage in the twentieth century.

[14] M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005).

[15] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) pp. 67-89.

[16] J. Swift 'Women and Art Education at Birmingham's Art Schools 1880-1920: Social Class, Opportunity and Aspiration' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) pp. 91-102.

these together have enabled a picture of Birmingham's early history to be pieced together, upon which this thesis has built and expanded.

1.5 De Montfort University

De Montfort University's Faculty of Art, Design and Humanities had its origins in Leicester School of Art, founded during 1869-70, and thanks largely to the efforts of Augustus Spencer and Benjamin Fletcher, principals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Leicester's art school gained a reputation for its links with local industries and trades, and for raising standards of design and workmanship across the city.[17] In spite of a relatively small demand for furniture designers in the Leicester region, the art school was active in the field of Furniture Design; encouraged by Fletcher, Harry Peach set up the Dryad cane furniture works in Leicester in 1906. Fletcher himself established a department for cane and wood furniture at Leicester School of Art in 1909, and in 1913 evening classes specifically for the workers at Dryad were started at the art school.[18] Students from the art school also designed for Dryad,

[17] http://gimson.leicester.gov.uk/gimsonarts/benjamin-j-fletcher/ accessed 14/9/14 & N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 143-4. Augustus Spencer (1960-1924) was a landscape painter and art teacher who studied at Keighly School of Art and then at the RCA. He became Headmaster of the Coalbrookdale School of Art in 1885, where he first met Benjamin Fletcher, and then Headmaster of Leicester School of Art from 1888-1900, and Principal of the RCA from 1900-1920. Benjamin Fletcher (1868-1951) was born in Shropshire, and while only 17 began teaching classes at Coalbrookdale School of Art, where Augustus Spencer was Headmaster. When Spencer was appointed head of Leicester School of Art, he took Fletcher, then aged 20, with him as his deputy. In 1900 Fletcher became principal of Leicester School of Art, a post he held until 1920, when he then became Principal of Birmingham's art school. While at Leicester, Fletcher developed links between local industries and the art school. Students of the school were employed in local businesses, and some former students and teachers set up their own businesses. Fletcher also introduced various craft classes to the art school including stone carving, fresco work, cane work, cabinet making, dress making, lace making and weaving. In addition to his work in the art school, Fletcher also believed that the standard of drawing among elementary schools could be improved, and set out a syllabus for drawing which was implemented in all elementary schools in Leicester. Fletcher's thought was that the if students were taught to draw in elementary schools, they would come to the art school far better equipped to undertake advanced work. See http://gimson.leicester.gov.uk/gimsonarts/benjamin-j-fletcher/ & L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p 129.

[18] http://www.gracesguide.co.uk/Dryad_Cane_and_Metal_Works & http://gimson.leicester.gov.uk/gimsonarts/benjamin-j-fletcher/ - both accessed 14/9/14 Harry Peach (1874-1936) was born in Toronto to English parents who moved back from Canada and settled in Leicestershire when Peach was a young child. As an adult, Peach was involved in the Literary and Philosophical Society in Leicester which was possibly where he met Benjamin Fletcher who was also a member.

and several went on to work at the company.[19] Leicester's students made furniture for hospitals and the Ministry during the Second World War, and the furniture department at the art school was still portrayed in a positive light in Farr's study of design in relation to industry in 1955.[20] Given Leicester's reputation and its activity in the field of furniture design, it too was considered a highly appropriate case study for this thesis.

The archive of the University has a substantial amount of material relating to art and design dating from 1870 when the art school was founded, which includes, amongst other items, annual reports, student registers, prospectuses, committee minutes, press cuttings, and photographs of classes. Prospectuses date from 1905, and there is an almost complete run through to the present day; these, along with some annual reports and quinquennial reviews of the National Council for Academic Awards were consulted for this thesis. In a similar manner to Birmingham, the history of Leicester's School of Art has been little documented. Lys de Beaumont's 1987 MPhil thesis *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* traces Leicester's early years, arguing that it was economic arguments for art education which influenced Leicester's outlook and curricula as the school sought to meet the needs of local manufacturers. The thesis gives a detailed early history of Leicester's Art School and is a valuable insight into the development of the school and the figures influencing its development. Like Cunningham's thesis does for Birmingham, it constitutes a foundation for this thesis and provides an historical context within which later developments at the school can be placed.

1.6 The problem of High Wycombe

Any study of art school curricula concerning furniture design would ideally include High Wycombe's art school, seeing as Wycombe was at the centre of the chair-making industry for many years and was a huge centre for UK furniture manufacturing, and the art school had a strong tradition of furniture making. High Wycombe's Science and Art

[19] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil thesis: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 134.
[20] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 164.

School opened in December 1893 for the purpose of 'giving evening classes for local boys in a variety of technical skills useful to the local furniture trade', and its founding was in part driven by the Technical Instruction Act of 1889, which gave local authorities the power to establish technical education institutions.[21] The School seems to have been comprised of both an art school and technical school; files at the National Archive reveal that the art school offered the Intermediate Certificate and National Diploma in Design during the late 1940s and into the 1950s, and applied to offer the Diploma in Art and Design at the school in the 1960s.[22] There are three files of material held at the National Archive: *High Wycombe School of Science and Art 1891-1894* (ED 29/3); *High Wycombe School of Art 1945-1955* (ED 167/6); *High Wycombe School of Art 1956-1964* (ED 167/7), but these do not constitute a complete history of the school and certainly do not give enough information to form an overview of furniture curricula at the school. Aside from these three files, there is very little extant primary source material relating to the school, a fact that was confirmed during a conversation with Dr Catherine Grigg, curator at Wycombe Museum, in September 2012, after several attempts to locate material had ended in frustration. Karen Wilson's 2003 PhD thesis *High Wycombe's Furniture Industry 1900-1950* is a useful study of the development in furniture (cabinet) making in Wycombe that occurred as chair making declined, and includes a chapter on the development of technical education in the town. John Rutland's MPhil thesis *The History of Art and Design Education in High Wycombe 1870-1970*, submitted in 2001, is an informative history of art and design education in the town, but it does not go into much detail about what was taught at the art school. Rutland makes use of many secondary sources for his work - local newspapers and the *Cabinet Maker* trade journal – from which it is possible to piece together a history of the art school, but which does not provide detailed information regarding course aims and curricula in the way that prospectuses from the RCA, Leicester and Birmingham do. A further source, Muriel Pilkington's book *Past, Present and Future: A History of Buckinghamshire Chilterns New University*, published in 2010, is a lay-person's history of the school of art which looks at art and design education in High Wycombe as a

[21] KA. Wilson *High Wycombe's Furniture Industry 1900-1950* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Liverpool, 2003) p. 173 & M. Pilkington, *Past, present and future: A history of Buckinghamshire Chilterns New University* (High Wycombe, 2010) p. 21.
[22] High Wycombe School of Art 1956-1964 ED 167/7 (The National Archives).

whole and focuses on the institution which became Bucks New University, rather than on the detail of what was taught at the art school. The work of Wilson, Rutland and Pilkington together constitute a coherent history of technical, art and design education in High Wycombe, and the development of Wycombe Technical Institute into Bucks New University, but they do not provide enough detailed information regarding course content of the art school to justify Wycombe's inclusion in this thesis. Whilst it is disappointing that the art school in the main furniture manufacturing centre in England is not included in this thesis, the three art schools which are included allow for a more complete exploration of the development of policy making related to art and design rather than technical instruction, and also allow a perspective on furniture design outside High Wycombe to be considered.

1.7 Primary source material on design education

Clive Ashwin has commented that 'it could be claimed that the development of public art education is more thoroughly documented through official sources than is the case with any other subject area', and research for this thesis has proved this to be true.[23] There is a uniquely large extant body of primary source material relating to art and design education, possibly because it was under governmental control to one degree or another for over a hundred and fifty years so policy discussion was well documented. There is some overlap in the source material with the development of technical and vocational education because as well as training artists, designers and art teachers, art schools also offered classes for apprentices and journeymen, though these had largely ended by the mid 1970s.

Nineteenth century sources relating to art and design education also constitute the early history of the Royal College of art, and are primarily parliamentary papers, as discussed earlier in this chapter. Twentieth century primary sources relating to policy on design education tend to have been published by governmental departments and bodies, such as the Ministry of Education, Council for Art and Industry or the National Advisory

[23] C. Ashwin, *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. v.

Council on Art Education, and many of them were published by HMSO. The majority of these are located at The National Archives and The British Library, and research trips in 2010, 2011 and 2013 were undertaken to view this material.[24] Other material not available at the British Library or The National Archives was located at the University of Birmingham and De Montfort University.[25]

The majority of the documents consulted were published by government and governmental bodies overseeing art and design education such as the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations (NACAEx), the National Advisory Council on Art Education (NACAEd), or the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (NCDAD). These documents outline recommendations for changes to art and design education, and thus are necessary to any investigation of the development of the subject. Whilst they give the 'official' view of design education – what different bodies thought that design students should be taught and what they should know - these sources do not show the actual outworking of those policies in art schools. The prospectuses of the art schools are one way of discovering what was taught in art schools, and these prospectuses were consulted for each of the art schools explored in the thesis. The

[24] The National Archives at Kew hold the following: National Advisory Council on Art Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* – draft (1960); National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design, *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (1964); National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design Memorandum number 1 *Memorandum on courses leading to the award of Diploma in Art and Design* (1972); Post War Export Trade Committee paper number 34 *Report of the Sub-Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry (draft)* dated (1942); Post War Export Trade Committee paper number 1 *Sub-Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry* (1942); Post War Export Trade Committee paper number 2 *Sub Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry: The Place of Design in Post-War Planning for Industry.* The following material was located at the British Library: Ministry of Education / National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the length of the Diploma Course* (1957); National Advisory Council on Art Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (1960) *Vocational Courses in Art and Design: Report of the Working Group on Vocational Courses in the Design Technician Area* (1974).

[25] The University of Birmingham library holds the following sources: Board of Trade *Working Party Report: Furniture* (1946); Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (1970); Design Council *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom: a report to the Design Council's Design Education Study Group by its Industrial Design Education Sub-Committee* (1977); Ministry of Education *Art Education* (pamphlet no. 6) (1946); Ministry of Education *Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools of Art: Second report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (1962), Ritchie, J *et al The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972). At De Montfort University was the Council for Art and Industry's *Design and the Designer in Industry* (1937) report.

information provided in prospectuses does vary between art schools and also over time; Leicester's prospectuses in particular give quite detailed information on furniture courses between the mid 1950s and the mid 1970s, while the information in Birmingham and the RCA's prospectuses is less comprehensive but nonetheless gives enough information to be able to piece together a picture of what was taught on furniture courses in the three art schools which allows comparison with recommendations made in policy documents. Prospectuses are aimed at a particular audience – prospective students of the art schools – and so the information in them, such as the aims of the art schools, or course aims, may well have been simplified, enhanced or manipulated to attract students, but lists of courses or course components taught are more reliable as sources of information. Policy documents contain recommendations, which are just that – recommendations – and a key way of finding out if those recommendations were implemented is by examining prospectuses listing the details of courses taught, as well as scrutinising subsequent policy documents to see if the same concerns are still being raised.

1.8 Historiography on the history of design education

The scholarship on the history of art and design education is relatively light in quantity, starting with an initial flurry of work published in the 1960s and 1970s followed by more sporadic works since then; it is almost as if the initial work has been taken as the final word on the development of art and design education. More recent published works also tend to focus on institutions or particular individuals within art and design education rather than the subject as a whole; Kirby's 1987 work on Sheffield School of Art or Macdonald's 2005 book focussing on influential art and design teachers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are two such examples.[26] The first work on the overall subject of art and design education is Nikolaus Pevsner's *Academies of Art Past and Present*, published in 1940. It traces the history of Academies of (Fine) Art from the Renaissance through to the first half of the twentieth century in Britain and Europe.

[26] J. Kirby *Useful and Celebrated: the Sheffield School of Art 1843-1940* (Sheffield, 1987); S. Macdonald *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art* (Cambridge, 2005).

While it does touch upon the School of Design and industrial art, Pevsner's book is a more general overview of fine art teaching and the academy and does not focus on design education as such.[27] Following Pevsner's work were five books published between 1963 and 1975, and these five constitute the initial and main bulk of scholarship on design education.[28] The first of these, Quentin Bell's *The Schools of Design*, is one of the only published works on the early history of the Government School of Design in London. Bell's study starts in the Renaissance period, with a look at the history of academies of art and the notion of the 'Academic Idea', as he calls it, before examining events leading up to the select Committee of 1835, the founding of the Government School of Design, and the involvement of the Royal Academy in the early years of the School. The point on which Bell bases his book are the debates around whether art education should take the form of workshops or academies; these were debates which had repercussions into the 1960s, when Bell was writing, and as a result he may have had a vested interest in making his argument.[29] Bell considered that neither an Academy-style system proposed by the painter Benjamin Haydon nor the Schools of Design up to 1852 could have been expected to be successful; Haydon's proposal was too far removed from anything the Government had envisaged, while the experimental workshop started in 1838 by the superintendent of the School, William Dyce, was impractical and, as Bell notes, unacceptable to those who were expected to pay for the schools.[30] Useful as Bell's book is as a starting point for a history of art and design education in England, its value is nevertheless limited as Bell claims that 'The history of the Schools of Design ends with the creation of the Department of Practical Art in 1852', which seems rather an odd claim to make as the schools of design did not cease to exist at this point, but were simply subject to the control of a new government department under the civil servant Henry Cole rather than the direct control of academicians and civil servants.[31] The contribution of Cole to art and design education would perhaps constitute a book in itself, which is perhaps why Bell chose to end his

---

[27] N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940).
[28] C. Ashwin *Art Education: Documents and* Policies (London, 1975); Q. Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963); R. Carline *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art* (London, 1968) S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970); G. Sutton *Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools* (London, 1967).
[29] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 2.
[30] *Ibid.,* p. 254.
[31] *Ibid.,* p. 253.

study with Cole's appointment within the Department of Science and Art. Bell also places a disproportionate focus on economic reasons behind the founding of the School of Design, suggesting that concerns regarding the superiority of French goods and increasing imports of those goods led the government to start the School of Design in order to train designers who could produce goods which would rival those from France. While the 'economic argument' (as Bell calls it) was one of the reasons the School of Design was founded, it was not the sole reason for the founding of the School.

The four works published after Bell's deal with different aspects of art and design education: the teaching of art and craft in primary schools; art teaching in general education; the history of art teaching in four countries; and a collection of primary source documents regarding art education, and are therefore not especially pertinent here, though are of note to this thesis for their tendency to simply echo Bell that economic reasons played the major part in the founding of the School of Design; none of them pay particular attention to the 1837 Select Committee report, preferring instead to take Bell's account as true. Gordon Sutton, lecturer in art and crafts at the City of Leicester College of Education, was the first to follow Bell with his 1967 work *Artisan or Artist*. Sutton's book is a essentially history of the teaching of art and crafts to children in elementary (now primary and secondary) education. He does provide some insights into the working of the schools of design, as schoolboys often attended classes at the schools of design - some as young as nine - though their progress was said to be so slow that '…they are not worth the inconvenience and trouble'.[32] The majority of Sutton's book however, focuses on younger children than would generally have attended the schools of design. In 1968, painter and writer Richard Carline's book *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art* was published. This is a history of art teaching in general education which examined whether progress in teaching art was sufficient and whether efforts still needed to be maintained.[33] Like Sutton's book, Carline's is also concerned with children in primary and secondary education, and as such, is not particularly relevant to this thesis, though there is one chapter which gives a useful summation of the Government School of Design between

[32] G. Sutton *Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools* (London, 1967) p. 47.
[33] R. Carline *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art* (London, 1968) p. iii.

1837 and the early 1850s when the national art curricula was introduced by Cole and elementary art education was introduced to the Poor Schools, which younger children attended. Following the work of Bell, Sutton and Carline, Stuart Macdonald, then lecturer in art and design at Manchester University's College of Education, wrote *The History and Philosophy of Art Education,* which was published in 1970. This is a comparative work that traces the history of art education in Britain, France, Germany and the USA starting with medieval guilds and academies and ending in the 1960s. Macdonald takes an educational point of view rather than an 'artistic' one, saying that 'art education is a branch of the subject education rather than of the history of art.'[34] Perhaps because of this standpoint his book is a very effective history of art and design education in England up to 1968, when the book was published. Though not giving as much detail as Bell's book, Macdonald covers the early history of the Schools of Design and the influence of Henry Cole; he subsequently focuses on fine art and art education with chapters on the Slade School and French ateliers. Handicrafts are also mentioned, as are European movements such as the *Werkbund* and *Bauhaus,* but Macdonald misses developments in England in the 1930s and 40s, omitting entirely the introduction of the National Diploma in Design and the change in art and design examinations in art schools.

Clive Ashwin's 1975 work *Art Education: Documents and Policies* is the final work in the initial flurry of scholarship on art and design education that began with Bell. It is a rather different work from the preceding four, being a collection of short extracts from primary sources relating to the development of art and design education, from the *Instrument of the Founding of the Royal College of Arts* in 1768 through to *Vocational Courses in Art and Design* (the Gann Report) in 1974. Documents included were selected, as the author notes, on the 'grounds of their relevance to the development of art education', and the book is an incredibly useful starting point for anyone wishing to identify some of the major policy documents on art and design education. Ashwin also includes brief expository comments alongside the extracts which provide an indication of the context in which the document was written, but at only 158 pages, and most of

[34] S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970) p. 5.

them merely extracts from primary source materials, his commentary is not comprehensive by any means.

Peter Cunningham's 1979 thesis *The Formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850 with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* was the first work to re-examine and revise the economic argument put forward by Bell, Sutton, Carline and Macdonald. Cunningham acknowledges the economic argument in relation to the founding of the schools of design, but argues that alongside this was an increase in the public encouragement of art, which was as concerned with 'national prestige and social benefits, as much as on the commercial advantages to be derived from art'.[35] Cunningham argues that the reasons for the founding of schools of art in Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds were very much related to local desire and need rather than a national drive to increase exports; he notes that in each city there were varying degrees of need for designers, but common to each city was a growing interest in the visual arts and philanthropic support for educational and cultural institutions - it was not only economic interests which led to the various schools being founded.[36]

More recent scholarship than Cunningham has also tended to disagree with Bell's argument that economic concerns were the main motivation for the founding of the School of Design, though his opinion is still given weight by some. Edward Bird's lengthy 1992 thesis entitled *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* also takes the economic argument as read in discussing the reasons behind the Government School of Design. He then focuses the main part of his thesis on the founding of the branch schools and on the National Course of Instruction set out by Cole and Redgrave; in particular he examines the development of the national system of art and design education and how it was controlled, and thus the thesis is a very useful resource on the role of Henry Cole in the history of art and design education. Mervyn Romans builds on the work of Cunningham in his 1998 thesis *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-*

[35] P. Cunningham *The Formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850 with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) abstract.
[36] P. Cunningham *The Formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850 with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) abstract.

Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain. Romans argues that the history of art and design education is more complex than 'either/or'- either the economic argument of Bell and others or the cultural/educational argument of Cunningham. He examines the 1835-6 Select Committee report more thoroughly than previous scholars and argues that what he calls the 'dominant' history (the economic argument) is flawed.[37] Romans explores notions of taste, fashion, consumerism and capitalism in relation to art and design education to argue that only through an interrelationship of all these elements can the situation at the time of the founding of the School of Design be understood.[38] Common to many of these sources is an examination of why the School of Design and branch schools were founded, but what is missing is analysis on how well the Schools worked and whether they fulfilled their purpose: this is what this thesis will develop.

One final work which has importance for this thesis is Robert Strand's 1987 work *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982.*[39] Strand was previously Principal of Epsom School of Art, before being Deputy Chief Officer to the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (NCDAD) and the Registrar of Art and Design on the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), and his book is an account of developments in art and design education through the twenty-two years of the scope of the book. Writing from his position inside both the NCDAD and the CNAA, Strand's book is written very much from the point of view of the two Councils and provides a very detailed narrative of the machinations of committee proceedings and policymaking and that took place as the Diploma in Art and Design (Dip A.D) was introduced and then as art schools became part of polytechnics and the Dip A.D became a Bachelor degree. Rather dry in places, and in spite of its limited scope of only twenty-two years, Strand's book nevertheless sheds light on an important period in the development of art and design education and is an excellent resource in piecing together the narrative of this time.

---

[37] M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Central England in Birmingham, 1998) abstract.
[38] *Ibid.,* abstract.
[39] R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design education in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* London: Council for National Academic Awards, 1987.

1.9 Overview of thesis

Utilising primary sources such as parliamentary papers, official reports and prospectuses to examine the development of policy on design education for the first time, whilst also expanding the scope of existing work on the history of design education, this thesis argues that changing historical contexts and circumstances within which design education developed led to tensions and discrepancies between policy and practice. This resulted in a profusion of policy recommendations as policy makers attempted to address the circumstances of the time, and also highlighted the inherent difficulties in delivering a subject which requires instruction in both theoretical and practical components. It is only by taking an overview of 155 years of design education that patterns in recurring issues in debates around what should be taught and how, can be fully seen. An overview of this nature also reveals the changing questions and issues which those policy-makers for design education were attempting to address: What is design and how should it be taught? Should design education focus more on industry, and if so, how many students should we train and how? Design education has to become more practical and relevant to industry; what should be taught to make it so? Will changes in higher education affect design education and if so, how? The recurring question has always been 'What should we teach, and how should we teach it', though the answer to that question has changed over time depending on the wider context within which design education has developed, as this thesis demonstrates.

Chapter two examines the background to the issues raised in the 1835-6 Select Committee and subsequent foundation of the School of Design. It argues that the Select Committee came about as a result of a mixture of concerns and interests: which included criticisms of the Royal Academy as a teaching institution; the perceived economic benefits of design: the notion of 'taste' and its relationship to manufacturing; nationalism; and a growing cultural interest in art and design. The chapter argues that there was no one single reason which led to the Select Committee, as other scholars have suggested, but rather it was a multiplicity of factors which were involved in the Committee and the foundation of the School. These themes develop in chapter three where it is demonstrated that some of the issues raised during the 1835-6 Select

Committee were to raise on-going questions of what design was and how it should be taught. The question of how design should be taught led to oscillating aims of the School of Design, with no clear intent or direction, through the initial years of the School. Resistance on the part of manufacturers to recognise the potential of design and designers to improve their products led to further reassessment of the School's aims in 1849 which resulted, ultimately, in design education taking a backward step by moving away from practical instruction in the 1880s and becoming standardised and formulaic; a system which remained in place for the following fifty years. Chapter four examines the 1930s which was the next juncture at which the question of design and its relation to industry was raised again, and by which time mechanisation had become commonplace in some industries and was just beginning in others. Policy-makers then had to contend with questions around whether design education would remain art and craft-based, or if it would begin to focus more on industrial processes and technologies, and if so, how much instruction in manufacturing could reasonably be expected to be delivered in art schools, and how should that be done? Before any of these questions were satisfactorily answered, though, war broke out, and the issues were temporarily laid to one side. By the time the Second World War ended and policy-makers began again to address the subject of design education, new materials and technologies developed during the war were beginning to be utilised by various industries. As chapter five goes on to argue, industries were increasingly, if not wholly, mechanised by this point, and it was clear that design education would have to take this into account if design graduates were to be of use to industry. It was no longer a question of 'if', but 'how' design education would focus more on industrial methods and provide appropriate training for design students. There was agreement amongst policy-makers that design (and designers) was of use to industry; the question was what training should design students receive in art school so that they could be of maximum benefit to industry once they left. One solution was the overhaul of the existing art and design examinations system, and the National Diploma in Design (hereafter NDD) was introduced in 1946, and was intended to be a far more practical qualification than previous Ministry of Education exams, though in practice it came in for criticism from industrialists and manufacturers for being too specialised, and was seen as primarily a teacher training qualification. Although the NDD was criticised, it was the first attempt by policy-makers to bring design education back to a

more vocationally-based training, and to return to the original aims of the School of Design in providing designers trained for specific industries. Post-war developments in higher and further education more widely also began to affect design education; in the late 1950s the Minister for Education decided that not only should art schools be given the freedom to design and examine their own courses for the first time, but art and design courses should be reviewed and should be of a standard similar to that of a university degree, a decision which led to a second overhaul of art and design education and the introduction of the Diploma in Art and Design (hereafter Dip A.D) in 1963-4. As chapter six demonstrates, not only did policy-makers now have to address the issue of industrial and technological components within design courses, but also questions concerning how to raise standards and introduce more academic elements to design courses to give them more parity with university degrees. In 1969 some art schools became part of polytechnic institutions, and in the mid 1970s art school diplomas became BA degrees. These institutional changes raised new questions regarding the standard and components of courses; art schools had previously been singular institutions or had shared facilities with technology colleges, now, as part of larger polytechnics, there were opportunities for design students to take a wider variety of subjects across disciplines if these were relevant to the overall aims of the design course. As shown in the conclusion, changes in higher education more widely have continued to affect design education since polytechnics became universities in 1992, and the volume of reports produced since that time would provide a fertile resource for anyone wishing to undertake a study of design education and its continued development. Perhaps proving that debates on design education are truly cyclical, many of the reports published since 2000 concern themselves primarily with the contribution design and the wider creative industries can make to the economy, and the need for Britain to compete with other countries in the area of design, echoing the concerns of the 1835-6 Select Committee.

Chapter Two: The background to art and design education in England

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the variety of factors leading to the Select Committee of 1835 and the subsequent founding of the Normal, or Head School of Design.[40] This was the first school of design in the country, and was to set the standard for art and design education. The chapter argues that the direction the School of Design was to take was uncertain from the start due the multiplicity of factors which influenced its foundation; economic concerns, the issue of nationalism and national identity through design, questions of taste and fashion, and concerns regarding the teaching at the Royal Academy all contributed to the founding of the School of Design. These factors are apparent in the Select Committee report of 1835, and have been explored by a number of scholars. Bell, Sutton, Carline and Macdonald have all tended to emphasise the perceived economic benefit of design as the primary factor leading to the School of Design, while Bird has noted the contribution of the painter Benjamin Haydon in events leading up to the Select Committee.[41] Cunningham has also acknowledged Haydon's influence but has also suggested that issues of nationalism and philanthropy were factors contributing to the founding of the School, while Romans concentrated on issues of taste and fashion as of importance to the Committee.[42] Bell also suggested that the perceived failure of the Royal Academy to provide any meaningful instruction for artists meant that any artists who did then work in manufactures found their training was ill suited for their work. Analysis of the text of the 1835-6 Select Committee report

[40] The title 'Normal' school is said to come from the French teacher training École Normal Superieure (Normal Superior School) founded in Paris in 1794. It was intended to be a model for other schools, and was to set the teaching standard or 'norm'. Presumably, by calling the School of Design the Normal School of Design, the intention was that it was to set the standard of design. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/418257/normal-school - accessed 18/12/14

[41] E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology, 1992) p. 80 onwards. For full information on Benjamin Haydon, see part I chapter 2 of Bird's thesis.

[42] P Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) pp. 1-2 and chapters 1 and 2 Cunningham's thesis. M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central England, 1998) p. 164 and onwards.

itself provides evidence for the arguments that previous scholars have made regarding the foundation of the School of Design, and indeed, each argument is valid.[43] This chapter, however, goes one step further in suggesting that all of these factors need to be taken into account when considering the foundation and subsequent nebulous aims of the School.

This chapter outlines each of the factors leading to the foundation of the School of Design in turn, starting with the Royal Academy and criticisms surrounding it, before moving on to examine the growing public interest in art allied with issues of patriotism and nationalism as examined by Cunningham. The chapter then goes on to explore the role of Benjamin Haydon in agitating for change and his influence on events leading up to the Select Committee of 1835-6. Following this, the Select Committee itself is examined, and the views of witnesses on the failure of the Royal Academy, the superiority of foreign goods, and the benefits of a school of design – particularly in relation to improving the taste of the public –are explored in order to further the argument that it was a multiplicity of factors which led to the founding of the School of Design. The chapter thus builds on previous scholarship regarding the founding of the School of Design by presenting a synoptic view for the first time to argue that there was no one single reason that the School was started; rather it was a combination of factors which contributed to its foundation and, crucially for this thesis, led to the confused beginnings of the School regarding what it was to teach, to whom and for what purpose. This was to have implications for design education for the next one hundred years, as is revealed through the remainder of the thesis.

2.2 Academies of Art in Europe and the Academic Idea

The Select Committee of 1835-6 had been convened to:

[43] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568. For the perceived economic benefits of design see I - 1705; I – 1246; II – 2060. For the moral benefits of design see I – 644-5; I – 655. For evidence regarding matters of taste, see II – 1092-3; I – 241; I – 386; I – 670. For the perceived failure of the RA see II – 1058; II – 1953; II – 1063 & II – 1974. For concerns over the French superiority in design see I – 166-7; I – 1442; I – 458; I – 397; I – 1674-9 & II – 535-7.

> inquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the ARTS and of the PRINCIPLES of DESIGN among the People (especially the Manufacturing Population) of the Country; also to inquire into the Constitution, Management and Effects of Institutions connected with the Arts…[44]

One of the main institutions connected with the arts in 1835 was the Royal Academy (RA), which had been founded in 1768 and was one of the only organisations in England providing education to young artists at the time. After its foundation however, the RA became the subject of criticism for not adequately providing that education. Professors were hardly turning up to teach their classes and contradictory advice was being given to students.[45] Therefore a Select Committee concerned with how best to extend an appreciation for the arts into the wider population was naturally going to scrutinise the main institution for the provision of art education in England and take action against its perceived failures in achieving that goal. One reason for the failure of the RA to provide an education to young artists lies in the origins of the RA itself and its concern with preserving 'high art' and the ideals of the first academies of art founded in the sixteenth century. It is in understanding the role the RA was intended to fulfil, and subsequent criticism surrounding this that a fuller appreciation of its relevance to events around the Select Committee of 1835 can be gained.

Prior to the founding of academies of art in Europe in the sixteenth century, painters had been trained in workshops associated with medieval guilds.[46] Training within these guilds was somewhat limited though, and those who wanted further training were obliged to look elsewhere. In the second half of the sixteenth century in Italy the first academies of art were started which offered more training than was available through the guilds.[47] One of the earliest academies of art was the Accademia del Disegno, or Academy of the Arts of Drawing, which had been founded in Florence in 1563 by

---

[44] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, iii. Capitals as per the text.
[45] C. Ashwin *Art Education: documents and policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 3.
[46] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 9.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 10. The Academy of St Luke at Rome was founded in 1595, the French Academy was founded in 1648; and the Royal Academy of the Arts of Berlin in 1699. See W. Sandby *The History of The Royal Academy of Arts: from its Foundation to the Present Time* (London, 1862) p. 64.

Cosimo I de' Medici (1519-1574) on the suggestion of Giorgio Vasari (1511– 1574).[48] Within the academies, students would copy models of casts (which were not available in workshops and guilds), and be taught the philosophy of art, good principles and taste.[49] The philosophy of these good principles and taste is essentially the notion of a hierarchy within fine art and has been named the 'Academic Idea' by Quentin Bell.[50] This hierarchy had its roots in the Renaissance and, according to Bell, had been theorised by the Italian Academies and put into practice by French painters.[51] The Academic Idea held that some genres of painting were more worthy than others, the most important being history painting, or *Istoria*, which emerged in Italy in the fifteenth century.[52] The genre of history painting was not a direct representation of historical events, but instead depicted what it was felt *ought* to have happened.[53] The main subject in history paintings was man, and, as Bell comments, because history was idealised through history painting, then man, as the subject of these paintings, was also idealised; beautifully proportioned and without blemish or wrinkle.[54] The art academies of Europe had two main aims: firstly they viewed themselves as guardians of the Academic Idea, holding to the notion that history painting and the human figure were the highest form of fine art, and secondly they were intended to raise the social status of painters,

---

[48] N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 42. Cosimo I de' Medici was a duke of Florence and the first Grand Duke of Tuscany from 1569 until his death. Keen to exercise his control over all areas of art and culture in order to consolidate the family dynasty, Cosimo founded a university and botanical garden in Pisa, whilst in Florence he founded a philosophical and literary academy, a botanic garden, and, in 1563, the Accademia delle Arti del Disegno, which was the first in Europe. See http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/139151/Cosimo-I & http://www.palazzo-medici.it/mediateca/en/Scheda_Cosimo_I_%281519-1574%29 - accessed 17/2/15.
Giorgio Vasari was an Italian architect, painter and writer best known for his work *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, a biographical work on Italian Renaissance artists. He undertook several commissions for Cosimo I in Florence including designing the Uffizi, redesigning and redecorating the Palazzo Vecchio, and working on the frescos in the dome of the Cathedral in Florence. He was the co-ordinator of the Accademia after its founding in 1563. See https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/vasarig.htm & http://www.palazzomedici.it/mediateca/it/Scheda_Giorgio_Vasari - accessed 17/2/15.

[49] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 13.

[50] *Ibid.,* p. 2.

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 2.

[52] http://italianrenaissanceresources.com/units/unit-6/sub-page-03/variety-in-an-istoria/ - accessed 17/2/15.

[53] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 3.

[54] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

bringing them equality with poets and philosophers who had already formed their own academies in the fifteenth century.[55]

2.3 Art Education in England prior to 1837 – the Royal Academy

Bird notes that prior to 1837, the main provider of art education in Britain was the RA, but some art instruction, mainly in drawing, had occurred in other establishments such as the Royal Military schools of Woolwich and Sandhurst, while the Trustees School in Edinburgh had offered drawing classes from 1760 onwards.[56] There were also some privately owned drawing schools, primarily in London, where private drawing masters gave lessons to the offspring of the rich.[57] Art education was not, however, widely available for the general public, especially for those without the means to pay for it. During the eighteenth century there had been various efforts made to set up an organised art institution, though it was not until 1768 that the Royal Academy of Arts (RA) as we know it was formed of a group of artists including the painters Joshua Reynolds and Thomas Gainsborough, and was granted royal patronage by George III.[58] The founding of the RA was relatively late in comparison to other European academies; in 1768 there were already fifty-one academies of art in existence in Europe, primarily in Italy, France and Germany, but also in Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Denmark, to give but some examples.[59]

---

[55] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 10.

[56] E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology, 1992) p. 37.

[57] *Ibid.,* p. 37.

[58] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 23. The first attempt to form an academy was in 1711 when a group of artists formed and called themselves an academy, though Bell comments that this group took the form of a sketching club with a model rather than an academy as we know it. There had also been an unsuccessful attempt to set up an academy of art in England in 1734; it came out of the Society of Dilettanti, a dining club comprised of those who had undertaken the Grand Tour in Italy. In 1755 two pamphlets on the subject of an Academy of Art in England were published. The first was by Nesbitt and called *The Necessity of a Royal Academy*; the second was entitled *The Plan of an Academy for the better cultivation…of Painting, Sculpture, Architecture and the Arts of Design in General,* though neither of the plans materialised into actual academies. See Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 21; J. Kelly 'The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and Identity in the British Enlightenment', Review by MH. McMurren in *Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 74, No 1 (March 2011) pp. 140-144; N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 184.

[59] See appendix 2 for a chronological list of the founding of academies of art in Europe.

There was a feeling amongst the founders of the RA that more recently founded European academies were moving away from the Academic Idea and the notion of the history painting as the highest form of art, and the RA was therefore modelled on the older European academies of art with the intention of going 'back to basics' and reinstating the original, pure, values of the Academic Idea; it was this that led the RA to be the subject of criticism during the 1835-6 Select Committee.[60] The RA concentrated on 'high art' – painting, sculpture and architecture – at a time when other European academies were beginning to see that art could be useful to manufactures. The initial aim of the Royal Academy was to establish 'a well-regulated school or Academy of Design for the use of students in the Arts and an Annual Exhibition, open to all artists of distinguished merit'.[61] On a significant point of clarity, it should be noted that, as Ashwin comments, the use of the word 'design' in 1768 did not carry the same meaning as it does today. He notes that 'design' was related to the Italian word disegno, meaning 'graphic intervention in the fine arts or architecture', or to the French dessin, or drawing.[62] The meaning of the word 'design' in 1768 was far more related to drawing and fine art than its connotations of designing and/or making an item as it might be employed today. The 'Academy of Design' set up by the RA was thus much more of a fine art institution than its name would suggest. It was envisaged that the Royal Academy school would be similar to the *Academie Royale* in Paris: there were to be Professors of anatomy, architecture, painting, perspective and geometry who would each deliver six lectures a year to the students, and in addition there were nine Visitors who should be 'painters of history, able sculptors, or other persons suitably qualified' and who would attend the schools monthly to examine students' work, advise and instruct them and 'endeavour to form their taste, and to turn their attention to that branch of the arts for which they shall be seen to have the ablest disposition'.[63] That the Professors had to be 'painters of history' indicates the desire of the RA to uphold the 'Academic Idea' and the hierarchy of fine art.

---

[60] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) pp. 18-19; p. 10.
[61] N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 185.
[62] C. Ashwin *Art Education: documents and policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 1.
[63] *Instrument* (of foundation of the Royal Academy of Arts) articles IX-XIII. Printed in full in W. Sandby *The History of The Royal Academy of Arts: from its Foundation to the Present Time vol. 1* (London, 1862) pp. 49-55.

2.4 Criticisms of the Royal Academy

While the intention behind the Royal Academy may have been worthwhile, it began to be subject to criticism for its teaching methods and inefficient practices and it was these on-going criticisms from various parties that was one of the factors leading to the 1835 Select Committee and was an issue raised during the Committee itself. The teaching at the RA had been criticised, as Ashwin notes, for failing to provide a coherent system of teaching and for giving students conflicting advice.[64] Benjamin Haydon, himself familiar with the workings of the RA, described the situation in the 1835 Select Committee, noting that the academicians took it in turns to instruct the students and the advice given by each academician would change depending on whether that person was a historical painter or a landscape painter.[65] Evidently, if academicians were coming in one by one and each telling the students slightly different things, the teaching would have been seen to be unstructured and incoherent. A further criticism of the RA, noted by Bell, was that Parliament specifically and the country more generally seemed content to let the RA 'get on with it', with no accountability and therefore no incentive for the RA to improve its practices. As Bell comments, the RA received Royal support, but it was not responsible to Parliament, so in effect, was an independent institution; this was a situation which led to further criticisms during the 1835-6 Select Committee.[66] This lack of accountability to Parliament or any other external body led to inefficiencies in the practices of the RA. At its outset the Academy was well equipped, having, in 1771, apartments in Somerset House which were described as 'the most superb of any in the world'.[67] Eight years later, in 1779, standards at the RA were described as 'not much above that of a common drawing school'.[68] According to Bell, the Academy Schools had come to be seen as an appendage to the main focus of the RA, which were the exhibitions that attracted the public, and therefore patronage, to the Academy.[69] Teaching then, had become a secondary concern after the importance of the annual

---

[64] C. Ashwin *Art Education: documents and policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 3.
[65] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* House of Commons (1836) HC 568, II – 1058.
[66] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 27.
[67] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 33.
[68] *Ibid.,* p. 33.
[69] *Ibid.,* p. 33.

exhibitions of the Royal Academy, and the primary provider of art education in England was not, in fact, providing teaching of any quality to young artists. During the Select Committee of 1835-6 the president of the RA, Sir Martin Archer Shee admitted that there might be problems with the RA, but defended its role. He was of the opinion that 'academies, on the whole, do good to the arts…', though he did follow with the point that it depends which academy one is talking about.[70] Shee went on to say that 'Academies, I conceive, are like all other institutions, producing a mixed effect. I know of no institution that has not its defects, and so have academies…'.[71] One of the principal defects of the RA was that art was not to be taught in relation to manufacturing or industrial purposes; this resulted from the desire of those within the Academy to uphold the Academic Idea, and was a criticism that was levelled at the RA during the 1835-6 Select Committee.

2.5 Industrial art and the Royal Academy

The continued and almost determined focus of the RA on the high art and the Academic Idea was in contrast to many of the European academies of art at the time, which had begun to recognise that art could be used for the benefit of industry and commerce and had been reorganised to focus more on benefitting manufactures. Nikolaus Pevsner cites the example of several European academies including that of Dresden, which was reorganised in 1762, six years before the RA was founded.[72] Setting out his plans for the reorganised Dresden Academy, the director of the academy Hagedorn wrote that 'Art can be looked at from a commercial point of view' and went on to note that 'it is no less useful to raise the demands abroad for one's industrial products'.[73] In a similar manner, those involved with the Academy in Vienna wrote in 1770, two years after the founding of the RA, that reorganisation of their institution would be useful as 'a

[70] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* House of Commons (1836) HC 568, II - 1953.
[71] *Ibid.,* II – 1954.
[72] The Academy of Fine Arts in Dresden came into being in 1764 and was the successor institution of the *Zeichen– und Malerschule* (School for Drawing and Painters) which had been founded in 1680.
[73] Cited in N. Pevsner, *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 153. Christian Hagedorn (1712 – 1780) was a German Art historian and collector and was director of the Dresden Academy from 1763.

particular recognition of the arts and no less a promotion of commerce', while the rules of the Berlin Academy, reorganised in 1790, state that institution's task to be to 'contribute to the well-being of the arts in general as well as to instigate and foster home industries, and by influencing manufacture and commerce, to improve them to such an extent that the taste of Prussian artists will no longer be inferior to that of foreigners'.[74] In Nuremburg, Augsburg, Stuttgart and Munich similar comments were made, whilst in Stockholm, The Hague, Copenhagen and Paris, academies were reorganised and remodelled to promote art for the benefit of the manufacturing industries.[75] While the older academies were being reorganised and re-modelled to be of more benefit to manufacturing, academies in places such as Barcelona, Naples, Frankfurt, Geneva and Carrara (Italy) had been founded during the second half of the eighteenth century with the sole intention of aiding trades and manufacturing.[76] There is evidence, then, that across Europe during the eighteenth century there was an acknowledgement that art could aid and improve manufactures and also, potentially, commerce.

In England, in 1762, a school had been set up by William Shipley, founder of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA), in order to train students 'in such manufactures as require fancy and ornament, and for which the knowledge of drawing is absolutely necessary', but as Bell succinctly comments, 'The venture came to nothing'.[77] One possible reason for the lack of an academy or school to train students for the benefit of manufacturing could have been the influence of Reynolds. Joshua Reynolds was president of the RA from 1768 until 1792, and according to Bell did not consider a school of art for the benefit of manufactures necessary. Reynolds was of the opinion that if the higher 'Arts of Design' were encouraged (at the RA) then 'these inferior ends'- by which he meant the improvement of manufactures - would be dealt with.[78] Reynolds' view, then, was of a 'top down' system of art; if the higher branches of art (painting, sculpture, architecture) were

---

[74] Cited in N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 152 & *Monatsschrift der Akademie der Künste und Mechanischen Wissenschaften zu Berlin* vol. 1, p 149 cited in N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p. 154.
[75] N. Pevsner *Academies of Art Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940) p 154-5.
[76] *Ibid.,* p. 156-7. Also see appendix 2 for dates that academies were reorganised.
[77] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 26.
[78] J. Reynolds *Discourse I* line 10 cited in Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 26.

encouraged, then almost by default, the lower branches of art (art for manufactures) would also improve. If those working in manufacturing saw the taste and style present in the higher branches of art, they would surely be inspired to emulate that in their own work, and standards generally would rise. This view of art resulted in art teaching at the RA being steered down a particular route not suited for manufactures or industry; it was high art which was to be encouraged and standards raised, and by default other branches of art, including those related to manufactures, would inevitably follow. Reynolds does not appear to have been alone in his view; Cunningham suggests that some of those who were keen to encourage art actually only wanted to raise the standard of high art so that it would almost by default affect (and raise) the standard of ornamental art.[79] In a similar manner to Reynolds, the Irish painter James Barry thought that if historical painting – *Istoria* – were revived, then the qualities inherent in these paintings would be carried through to all other branches of art, including ornamental art.[80] Martin Archer Shee wrote in his 1805 *Rhymes on Art* that good taste affected everything, from the painter to the 'mechanic at the anvil and the loom', while Prince Hoare, Secretary for Foreign Correspondence at the RA, cited examples from France and the Berlin Academy between 1802 and 1805 where the quality of the manufactures had apparently come about through the encouragement of painting in the respective countries.[81]

Bell also suggests that to start and expand art training as applied to manufactures in England would have necessitated the training of teachers, and possibly the establishment of regional art schools, which would have required direct financial aid from Parliament. Prior to 1837 the expansion of art training seems to have not been desired, and financial aid from Parliament was not offered.[82] After 1837 and the founding of the School of Design in London, those in charge were to discover that expanding art training in England did indeed require the establishment of regional art schools and the training of art teachers, as well as financial assistance from Parliament;

---

[79] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 22.
[80] MA. Shee *Rhymes on Art* (2nd Ed) 1805, p. xxxv, cited in *Ibid.,* p. 24.
[81] MA. Shee *Rhymes on Art* (2nd Ed) 1805, p. xxxv, cited in *Ibid.,* p. 24, & p 20.
[82] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 27.

this was an issue which Henry Cole was more than willing to tackle, as demonstrated in chapter three.

In the late eighteenth century the provision for art education *per se* in England was therefore minimal, and art education for manufactures non-existent. When seen against the situation in France it becomes apparent just how scant was art education in England. In 1777 the painter Barry reported that in Paris alone, in that one year, 5500 students were being educated in art, with 1500 of these being trained specifically to aid manufactures.[83] Compare that to President of the RA Martin Archer Shee's comment during the Select Committee that just 1800 students had attended the academy schools since their foundation (in 1768), and it is clear that provision for art education in England was severely limited.[84] By 1836, art education was also being delivered in around eighty provincial schools of art in France and taking these numbers into account, it can be seen that art education in that country was far more widespread than was the case in England at the time of the 1835 Select Committee. In England the RA evidently wanted to hark back to a former ideal and concentrate on fine art and architecture, while other academies on mainland Europe were looking forward and realising the potential benefits of applying art to manufacture and trades. As Bell notes, 'foreign countries were devoting a great deal of time and money to the education of artists and artisans while we did nothing'.[85]

2.6 The superiority of foreign goods

Given that no attention was paid to art in relation to manufactures in England it is also not surprising that by the time of the 1835-6 Select Committee, some 50 years or so after the RA was set up, it was felt that British goods were inferior in their design compared to those from France. Bell comments that British workmanship had achieved high standards, but that British invention had been more devoted to economy and quantity rather than the quality of design, and this is seen in the testimonies of those

[83] *Ibid.,* p. 27.
[84] *Ibid.,* p. 27 & *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, II - 1963.
[85] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 46.

before the 1835-6 Select Committee.[86] Various witnesses attested to the superiority of goods from abroad, particularly those from France. James Morrison, head of a large commercial house in London, was a purchaser of both British and foreign made goods and had been familiar with the state of manufactures for twenty years. He commented to the Committee that: 'I have found generally that we have been very much superior to foreign countries in respect of the general manufacture, but greatly inferior in the art of design'.[87] Robert Harrison, connected with a silk manufacturing firm, also noted that in 'designs and patterns' English silk goods were inferior to the French, while Benjamin Spalding, also questioned about silk goods, agreed that English pattern makers were 'inferior in a proper knowledge of the art of design'.[88] One witness, William Wyon, engraver to the Royal Mint, had lived in Birmingham but had left twenty years previously and since then had paid only occasional visits to the city. He was nonetheless questioned by the Committee as if he were an expert on the manufactures of Birmingham even though his views may have been a little dated. In the area of plated silver and brass work, however, Wyon felt that the French were much superior to the English 'because there is a purer style derived from the study of nature and antique sculpture' and noted that when manufacturers of silver plate and brass wanted new designs, they looked to France for inspiration.[89]

When reading the Select Committee report of 1835-6, the issue of the superiority of foreign goods is apparent almost straight away as it is among the first of the questions that witnesses were asked. Therefore a cursory glance at the beginning of many

---

[86] *Ibid.,* p. 46.

[87] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I – 166-7.

[88] *Ibid.,* I – 458 & 397.

[89] *Ibid.,* I – 1674 - 1679. Robert Butt, superintendent of the bronze and porcelain department from the firm *Messrs. Howell & James* of Regent Street noted that 'with a few exceptions, in metallic manufactures the French are vastly superior to us in their designs'. He was then asked if the French were superior to the English in areas of moulding and fusing the metal and replied that 'it is not considered that they are'. Charles Cockerell, architect to the Bank of England and associate of the RA noted that in respect of articles of porcelain, those from abroad were superior 'in the forms and in the design of ornament, and the adjustment of colours'. George Morant, a house decorator from New Bond Street observed that he found that in the area of silk, manufacturers in England 'feel a very great inferiority indeed', particularly regarding the design itself rather than the execution of the design. See *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix* (1835) HC 598, 543; *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I – 1442 & II – 535-7.

statements would lead one to think that concerns over the superiority of foreign goods was the only thing the Committee was concerned with, though this would be too simplistic an argument to make. Although there are questions directed at witnesses regarding the superiority of the design of foreign goods, the questions that follow are about whether educating workers in art would improve the design of goods, and how that education could occur (a school of design, museums and galleries or travelling exhibitions), rather than about the economic benefits this would bring to the country. The thrust of the Committee's questions centred around the issue of educating the public in art and how best this could be achieved; questions were not about art education specifically for the benefit of commerce, suggesting that the emphasis of Bell *et al* on economic concerns was perhaps overstated. However, from these early questions to witnesses it is easy to see where Bell and others found evidence for the argument that it was economic concerns regarding increasing imports of foreign goods which were the primary reason for the founding of the School of Design. Indeed it is an argument that is not without strength. There was minimal provision for art education in England in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and those at the RA were reluctant to concentrate on anything other than high art, while countries such as France recognised the value of widespread art education and the benefits it could bring to manufacturing. This was evidently reaping rewards as French goods were felt to be superior in the area of design to those from Britain. To the British manufacturers of items such as textiles, ribbons, metalwork, furniture and pottery it was becoming clear that the public preferred the designs of goods from abroad, which resulted in increasing imports of foreign-made goods, a situation of concern to the Government. Perhaps it was implicit in the questions posed by those on the Committee that educating the public in art would improve the design of goods and therefore demand for them would increase, but given the length of the Committee reports, relatively few questions address the issue directly.

Although economic concerns were not uppermost in the mind of those on the Committee, the link between improving manufactures and public demand for goods have obviously been made, as several witnesses were asked if they thought improving design would increase demand for their goods. William Wyon was asked 'if the designs

for the metallic manufactures were improved, the demand would increase?' and he answered, 'I am certain that it would'.[90] Similarly, J Papworth, an architect, was asked if extending a knowledge of art 'into the regions of manufacture…that the demand would much increase for the articles which they design?' and replied 'I should think it would, considerably'.[91] Benjamin Spalding commented that one of the arguments used against educating artisans was that the public would buy goods purely because they were French, regardless of their merit, so no matter how well designed British goods were, because they were not French, they would not be purchased. Spalding himself disagreed with this view, however, and was of the opinion that the public bought the goods they liked the most, regardless of whether they were French or British, so if they liked British goods more, they would purchase those.[92] The implication, of course, was that if British goods were better designed, the public would prefer them and purchase them. It seems that the Committee had realised that a by-product of education in art might result in more British products being purchased by the public. Spalding was then asked 'You think the best way to counteract the French superiority, would be by the instructing our manufacturing artists, do you?', and replied 'I do'.[93] He also commented that a school of design would be beneficial because; 'there are many articles which we are importing from France, which undoubtedly if we were in possession of designs, might be equally well manufactured here'.[94] When asked if a school for instruction in 'the elementary art' would be beneficial, Sir John Paul Dean answered that he had 'no sort of doubt of it'.[95] As he succinctly put it, 'You never can improve if you have no school'.[96] Similarly, John Henning, the modeller and sculptor, was asked if 'instruction in the arts generally, in a national point of view, is advisable for persons acquainted with the manufactures of this country?' and answered that 'Every man who follows any

[90] *Ibid.,* I - 1705.
[91] *Ibid.,* I - 1246.
[92] *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix* (1835) HC 598, 324.
[93] *Ibid.,* 324.
[94] *Ibid.,* 322.
[95] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, II – 2060.
[96] *Ibid.,* II – 2061.

profession should have something relating to his profession; and a workman, such as jeweller, ought to be a draftsman…'.[97]

Perhaps to try and gain a clearer picture of the situation regarding art as applied to manufactures in Britain, the Select Committee did ask Martin Archer Shee, president of the RA, if he could give many instances of people who had been educated in the RA who were now employed in the 'manufacturing districts in the country?'.[98] Shee was unable to provide an answer to that question, but was in 'no doubt of the fact' that people educated in the RA were working in such places, stating that is was a 'very reasonable conclusion'.[99] Shee's assumption was that if students had not managed to become artists upon leaving the academy schools, they would be working in art as applied to manufactures. 1800 students had been educated at the RA by 1836, and, as Shee said, 'what has become of those men? They have not all become artists'.[100] However only one, that the Committee knew of, was working in manufactures; Shee was not aware of that evidence, but his opinion regarding the usefulness of art to manufactures may be gleaned from a later question in which he was asked whether he agreed with a political economist that academies were hostile to the fine arts. Shee, in his reply, stated that 'the principle of commerce and the principle of art are in direct opposition the one to the other'.[101] It seems that Shee at least, was not convinced of the benefits of applying arts to manufactures; the Royal Academy was focussed on 'higher' pursuits rather than concerning itself with commerce and manufacture. Little wonder then, that the RA was criticised over its failure to provide any assistance to manufactures over the years.

The Royal Academy had been the subject of criticism, firstly for failing even to provide adequate art education for young artists in the high arts, and secondly for failing to also provide any art education as might be applied to manufactures. In continental Europe, other academies of art were being re-organised and founded for the purpose of being of

[97] *Ibid.,* I - 866-7.
[98] *Ibid.,* II - 1962.
[99] *Ibid.,* II - 1962.
[100] *Ibid.,* II - 1963.
[101] *Ibid.,* II – 1974.

use to manufactures and this was having clear benefits; by the 1835 Select Committee it was evident in the testimonies of witnesses that French goods were superior in their design to British goods. Provision for art education - even not specifically related to manufacturing – had been minimal in Britain, and again this was brought to light during the Select Committee of 1835-6. One man who had long been campaigning for an improvement in art education in Britain, and who was also a critic of the Royal Academy and its methods, was the painter Benjamin Haydon, and his role in events leading up to the Select Committee is examined next.

2.7 Agitation for change: Benjamin Haydon

Benjamin Haydon was born in 1786 and had entered the Royal Academy School in 1805, first exhibiting at the RA in 1807.[102] A disagreement over the hanging of one of his works, *The Assassination of Dentatus,* brought him into conflict with the Academy. Haydon had submitted his painting to the RA in 1809, but it was removed from the main room and hung in an antechamber where it was, according to Haydon, 'perfectly invisible'.[103] This event aggrieved Haydon and he criticised the RA and the academicians in public, resulting in him being at odds with the RA from that point onwards.[104] Bird cites from Haydon's diary where he has written;

> Thus then for the rest of my anxious life my destiny was altered. I had brought forty men and all their high connections on my back…[105]

It seems Haydon was well aware of the consequences of attacking the Royal Academy, but Bird suggests that one result of Haydon's conflict was that the art scene was brought into public view. As Bird wryly notes, 'Haydon's attacks shocked, they were

---

[102] http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artists/benjamin-robert-haydon-243 & http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/257746/Benjamin-Robert-Haydon - accessed 3/1//14.
[103] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 43.
[104] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[105] BR. Haydon *Autobiography and Memoirs* (London, 1962) p. 130 cited in E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology, 1992) p. 79.

scandalous and the public then as now were interested in scandal'.[106] While the 'shock factor' of Haydon's attacks may have brought arts and the machinations of the RA to the attention of the public, Bird argues that Haydon's writings - and criticisms of the arts – helped to start a political debate on art which eventually culminated in the 1835 Select Committee. Cunningham also takes this view, writing that Haydon 'waged a tenacious and at times ferocious public and political campaign for state intervention in art throughout the 1820s and 1830s'.[107] Whether this was driven by Haydon's annoyance with the RA, or by a genuine desire to further art education in Britain is not clear, but regardless, Haydon's activities did play some part in the events preceding the 1835 Select Committee and so must be considered here.

Haydon wanted state intervention in art, feeling that with this support, England could produce artists as great as those in Italy or Greece, and so he started to look to those outside the RA for support for art. Part of this campaigning took the form of petitioning members of Parliament, though many of those Haydon approached were those who had artistic and educational interests themselves and who, as Cunningham comments, did not entirely approve of Haydon's attack on the Royal Academy.[108] As Cunningham notes, schools of design were not mentioned specifically in any of Haydon's petitions though he had suggested a school of design prior to any of his petitions to parliament, in a letter to Lord Castlereagh, the foreign secretary, in 1815, in which he wanted 'the establishment of a system of Public Schools of Design for the benefit of the art and the manufactures of the country'.[109] Between 1823 and 1839 Haydon petitioned parliament seven times regarding matters of art, and although frequent petitioning to Parliament may seem like the activities of a man with a grudge, Cunningham notes that before the 1832 Reform Act petitions to Parliament were common, so Haydon's activities in this

[106] E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* (unpublished PhD thesis: Loughborough University of Technology) p. 80.
[107] PJ. Cunningham, *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 44.
[108] *Ibid.*, p. 45. For a list of Haydon's petitions to parliament see Cunningham p 48.
[109] BR. Haydon *Correspondence and a table* talk. With a memoir by his son, FW Haydon, 2v. 1876 cited in *Ibid.*, p. 47-9.

regard were not especially unusual.[110] Haydon was also commissioned to paint a picture commemorating the Reform Banquet of 1832, and this, as Cunningham notes, may have given him further opportunity to talk to parliamentarians about state sponsorship for art while they sat for him.[111] Between 1837 and 1841, after the School of Design had been founded, Haydon travelled around the country, lecturing on art. In addition to lectures in London, Haydon visited Glasgow, Edinburgh, Warrington, Hull, Liverpool and Bath.[112] He also lectured in Birmingham, and after visiting the factories there reportedly declared that if any town needed a school of design, it was Birmingham.[113] Cunningham suggests that although Haydon was not on the Council of the School of Design - which was another sore point for him - through his public lectures he probably did more to stimulate more widespread interest in art education than anyone else, which eventually led to the founding of provincial schools of design.[114]

2.8 Public interest in art

Haydon's attacks on the Royal Academy may have brought matters of art and the RA to the public's attention, but Cunningham's thesis argues that this was in a climate of already increasing public interest in art. Cunningham claims that 'the true motivation for establishing Schools of Design is to be seeing in a growing interest in the visual arts…', rather than for economic reasons, and that those who advocated education in, and patronage of, art, did so for various reasons; the desire to raise the status of art, patriotism and nationalism, and the relationship of art to the state.[115] The argument put

---

[110] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 43-4 & PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 61.

[111] Bell claims that Haydon used the opportunity of painting parliamentarians to talk to them, though Cunningham thinks that this is slightly exaggerated, citing Haydon's diaries as a more truthful account of what happened, and noting that Haydon listened as much as he talked to the parliamentarians, as he loved hearing political gossip. See PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 63.

[112] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 77.

[113] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 1 & 6.

forward regarding the perceived economic benefits of design was, according to Cunningham, a means to an end to secure funding from parliament for a school of design, especially 'when utilitarian principles guided much of public expenditure…', but Cunningham argues that the primary factor leading to the schools of design was the increasing interest in the visual arts which was apparent in the desire to raise the status of art, the moral benefits of art, the usefulness of art in advancing patriotism and nationalism in the public, and also (but of least importance according to Cunningham), the commercial benefits of art.[116]

This growing interest in art during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was, according to Cunningham, represented by various contemporary journals and writings on art which appeared from 1769 onwards and which included Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses*, Martin Archer Shee's *Rhymes on Art* and Prince Hoare's *Academic Annals of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture*.[117] All of these publications predate Haydon's view that encouragement of art is beneficial to society and thus while Haydon may have been an influential figure in events leading up to the 1835 Select Committee, Cunningham argues he was not the first to recognise the benefits to society that art could bring.[118] Following these early publications from Reynolds and others, periodicals on art began to emerge: *The Artist* was first published in 1807; *Annals of the Fine Arts* in 1816; *Art Union* in 1839; and the *Journal of Design and Manufactures* in 1849.[119]

---

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 1 & 6.

[117] J. Reynolds *The Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Knt. Late President of the Royal Academy: containing his discourses, idlers, A journey to Flanders and Holland (now first published) and his commentary on Du Fresnoy's Art of Painting; reprinted from his revised copies.…To which is prefixed an account of the life and writings of the author; by Edward Malone, Esq.* (London, 1797). These were a series of lectures delivered to Royal Academy students between 1769 and 1790. Shee's work called for the national patronage of artists. MA. Shee *Rhymes on art, or, The remonstrance of a painter* London, 1805. P. Hoare *Academic annals of painting, sculpture and architecture: published by the authority of the Royal Academy of Arts. 1805-6, 1807, 1808-9. Collected and arranged by Prince Hoare* (London, 1809). Hoare's publications followed developments in academies on the Continent. PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 7.

[118] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 7.

[119] *The Artist* started in 1880 as a trade magazine published by William Reeves, the art suppliers. A year later it changed its name to *The Artist and Journal of Home Culture.* From 1897 it concentrated on decorative art, with emphasis on the Arts and Crafts movement. The *Annals of the Fine Arts* was a quarterly magazine published between 1816-1820; edited by James Elmes it was influenced by Haydon

Cunningham suggests that the main influence on the desire to raise the status of art was Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses,* which was important in giving art a 'philosophical credibility', in turn inspiring other writers and artists to champion art and desire to raise its status.[120] Art was felt to have had a high status in ancient Greek society, and part of the interest in the arts in Britain was due, contends Cunningham to the 'Greek revival' happening in Britain during the mid to late eighteenth century and given added momentum by the archaeological excavations at Pompeii and Herculaneum during the 1750s.[121] In addition, young men were returning from their Grand Tours with collections of antique casts and sculptures, which were then studied.[122]

2.9 The moral benefits of art

Aiding the claim that visual art should have a high status in Britain was the perceived moral influence of art.[123] Cunningham cites the preface to Bryan's 1816 *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*:

> The painter's art, in this exercise of its more elevated facilities, inspires the mind with a taste for whatever is good, as well as what is beautiful: fills the heart with the most salutary sensations, and promotes the love of virtue and the abhorrence of vice…[124]

Other writers such as the artist Henry Sass and Prince Hoare went a step further in suggesting that art was part of a divine plan – Sass thought that it was the duty of man to cultivate all aspects of his intellect in reverence to his Creator, while Hoare felt that

---

who was a friend of Elmes. The *Journal of design and Manufactures* was published between 1849 and 1852 and was edited by Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave. It was aimed at the middle classes and concentrated on decorative and applied arts.

[120] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 9.

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[124] M. Bryan *Biographical and critical dictionary of painters and engravers* 1816, v.1 p. 5, cited in PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 11.

'the arts distinguish civilised, rational creatures, acting under Providence'.[125] A slightly different, but equally influential idea of the moral basis of art came from Reynolds who thought a painting should tell a story with a moral purpose. According to Reynolds, the painter should try and improve men with 'the grandeur of his ideas', although as Cunningham notes, Reynolds and other writers on the subject mostly failed to put their theories into practice.[126]

The view that art could have a moral effect on society was a strongly held one; the feeling was that if the public saw paintings which were beautiful and tasteful, they would be inspired to follow what was virtuous and good themselves; a view held by Reynolds and used as an argument against a school of design in England. An artist had to be educated in history, literature and classics, for it was only by having knowledge of such things, as well as being inspired to paint, that he would be able to express his grand ideas.[127] It was, as Reynolds wrote; 'this intellectual dignity, they say, that enables the painter's art; that lays the line between him and the mere mechanik'.[128] This view, that an artist was somehow more learned and intellectual than a 'mere mechanik' carried through into the nineteenth century, and had its influence over discussions of the purpose of the School of Design and what its students should be taught. One witness to the 1835 Select Committee, Charles Harriott Smith, a sculptor of stone and marble architectural ornaments, noted that not only had his workmen improved their own work through 'good practice and emulation amongst themselves' after seeing exhibitions of works of art, but the habits of the workmen had also improved.[129] Smith went on to comment that this was to be attributed to:

> the change that has taken place of late years, by dividing those workmen who are fond of malt and spirituous liquors, from those who attend the coffee-houses and coffee-shops…the men who attend the coffee-shops seem to consider themselves belonging to a more respected class of society, and will not associate with those who go to public houses.[130]

---

[125] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 11.
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[127] *Ibid.*, p. 12.
[128] J. Reynolds *Discourses III* 1770 in *Works of Sir J Reynolds* (4th Ed) 1809, p. 51 cited in *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[129] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I – 644-5.
[130] *Ibid.*, I - 655.

Smith also commented that his workmen who were further removed from the 'mechanical departments' and were more involved in the production of art, had 'a greater disposition to read' as well, and agreed that further means of improvement for workers would be good as their tendency was 'to a greater degree of refinement'.[131] Evidently, if art (or education in art) could change men's drinking habits and lead them to read more, thus refining their morals and tastes, more widespread instruction in art was only going to be seen as a good thing.

2.10 A national style

As well as increasing public interest in art through publications and journals, and the desire to raise the status of art coupled with the perceived moral benefits of art, Cunningham suggests that another factor which must be considered when examining the Select Committee of 1835-6, is the use of art to promote a national style or taste. Cunningham traces the roots of this back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, noting that in Europe, various writers were claiming that a national 'feeling' or style had shaped their art. He cites the examples of Johann Winckelmann, one of the first art historians, who suggested that Greek sculpture reflected the 'noble simplicity and quiet grandeur' of the Greek spirit, and the French philosopher, mathematician and music theorist Jean D'Alembert who thought that art was a repository for the life and spirit of man.[132] In Britain in 1774 the painter James Barry cited Vasari in suggesting that the civilised Italian republics had created conditions favourable to the rise of Italian art; in other words, Italian art reflected the civilised Italian culture.[133] Following Barry, the theorist and connoisseur Richard Payne Knight's work of 1805 *An Analytical Inquiry into the Principals of Taste* took, according to Cunningham, an anthropological view which stated that as the art and architecture of the past had reflected the character

---

[131] *Ibid.*, I – 656 & 658.

[132] W. Leppmann *Winckelmann* (1971), p. ix, cited in PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 13.

[133] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 13.

of that particular age, so contemporary art should also reflect the contemporary national character.[134] Cunningham writes that there were several ways in which art could reflect the status of a nation; one by creating immortality through the production of such works as would be remembered 'in the annals of mankind' for their greatness.[135] Additionally, there was the notion that art could be used to promote national virtues by portraying English character and achievements, primarily through public works such as monuments and commemorations.[136] Cunningham cites Shee, who wrote that such works would produce 'respect and consideration from our neighbours and competitors…', and would also 'make men proud of their country...'.[137] There was then, the feeling of a twofold benefit to public works; other nations would be reminded of Britain's achievements, and they would serve to instil national pride in the country's citizens.

2.11 A changing society

The desire to encourage art, whether due to increasing public interest, notions of the moral value of art, or the sense that national pride and achievements could be expressed through art, was not without difficulties, however. As a result of the industrial revolution, as Bell comments, the relationship between art and industry 'had been upset by the advent of steam power and a whole new clientele had come into existence which was increasingly far removed from the spending habits and tastes of the eighteenth-century dilettante'.[138] During the eighteenth century, patronage for art had generally come from the monarchy and aristocracy, though during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, that position was changing. Manufacturers were finding themselves with money, and in a desire to raise and publicise their status, had started to take an interest in purchasing works of art. As Cunningham notes, patronage now came from

---

[134] *Ibid.,* p. 13-14.
[135] MA. Shee *Rhymes on Art* 1805 (2nd Ed) preface, cited in *Ibid.,* p. 14.
[136] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 14.
[137] MA. Shee *Rhymes on Art* 1805 (2nd Ed) p xxv, cited in *Ibid.,* p. 14.
[138] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 34.

'merchants and manufacturers and public institutions'.[139] These were the *nouveau riche*; those who had made their money through industry and to whom the Academic Idea meant little, but who were to now provide the patronage for and determine the taste of the Academy as they sought to raise their social status.[140] Whilst patronage was one means of encouraging art, as Cunningham notes, it presupposed the education of laymen in art, and this, in turn posed a problem if uneducated laymen were buying works of art and dictating the styles and tastes of art.[141] Bell comments that in 1768 when the RA was founded, England was an agricultural nation where people still had a respect for the arts and an understanding of the Academic Idea.[142] The changing economic and social situation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries allowed for more social mobility upwards; moreover, the belief that one's class was inherited and unchangeable was also becoming less entrenched.[143] As Altick wrote; 'Theoretically there was nothing to prevent a man fired by praiseworthy ambition from rising as high as his talents and exercise of the appropriate prudential virtues allowed'.[144] In a similar vein, Wilson wrote that there was now

> the chance for the meanest artisan to rise, through energy and enterprise, through the ranks. The calico printer and cotton master becomes within two generations the baronet and the bigwig.[145]

Through the increase in industry the economy expanded relatively quickly during the nineteenth century, and, as Guy comments, with the availability of 'surplus value' (so called by economists), new markets for art developed, particularly among the middle classes.[146] With the expansion of the art market came the concern that those who now had money to spend on art and objects for the home did not have the required level of knowledge or taste to know what was good or bad art. As art became more and more a part of domestic life, it came under increasing public scrutiny. Concerns around

---

[139] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 28.
[140] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 34.
[141] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 27.
[142] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 34.
[143] RD. Altick *Victorian People and Ideas* (London, 1974) p. 18.
[144] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[145] AN. Wilson *The Victorians* (London, 2003) p. 59-60.
[146] JM. Guy *The Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and Documents* (London, 1998) p. 313.

aesthetics and taste therefore began to be debated much more widely, and to be applied to manufactured goods. There were, according to Guy, two strands within the debate about aesthetics; the first, and most pertinent to this thesis, related to 'the nature of aesthetic value – basically, that is, what the criteria were which defined a good….painting'.[147] The Victorians were confident that a consensus about aesthetics and taste could be reached; not difficult though, as Guy notes, if all those involved in forming that consensus were predominantly male, white, and all middle or upper class.[148] This consensus could be seen through the work of the RA and its adherence to the Academic Idea. The notion of the history painting the human figure as the highest form of art was still held by those at the RA, and this view of art also influenced the initial years of the School of Design; many of those on the Committee of the School at its foundation were Academicians, who had clear ideas on what constituted good art and used this criteria to specify what good design was, which then impacted on what was (or was not) taught at the School of Design.

2.12 The Select Committee of 1835-6

Mervyn Romans notes in his thesis that the 1835 Select Committee was not an 'out of the blue' isolated event – as if suddenly parliamentarians had become aware that something needed to be done about art and manufactures, but was the culmination of several Select Committees held previously concerning foreign trade, particularly in relation to silk goods.[149] Romans suggests that this might imply a sort of snowball effect, ending with the 1835 Committee, though this is difficult to prove, but evidently the position of British trade and silk goods, particularly when seen against French goods, was already an issue for government.[150] Romans posits that all of these prior select

[147] *Ibid.*, p. 314.
[148] *Ibid.*, p. 314.
[149] M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Central England, 1998) p. 60. In 1818 there was a Select Committee on Silk Ribbon Weavers Petitions, and in 1821 the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Foreign Trade. Following these, in 1831-2 and in 1834, reports on Anglo-French relations paid particular attention to silk, while in 1833 was the Select Committee on the State of Manufactures, Commerce and Shipping. See Romans p. 60-1.
[150] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

committees indicate a knowledge of the concerns regarding foreign trade and imports of foreign goods, and help to place the 1835 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures into the context of on-going debates in this area. The situation had occurred then, that there was an existing concern regarding trade, silk goods and the superiority of the design of French goods; this, alongside an increasing awareness of and interest in art on the part of the public, issues regarding the Royal Academy and its teaching methods, and a realisation that art education for workers could be beneficial to manufactures, all came together in the melting-pot that was the Select Committee of 1835-6. There were, as has been demonstrated, too many factors at play to be able to pinpoint one as 'the' reason for the Select Committee; rather, it was a coming together of various issues around art, trade and manufactures which brought the Committee into being. One of the men whom Haydon had petitioned regarding art was the Liberal MP for Liverpool, William Ewart; a man with a commercial background whose father was a merchant in Liverpool. Ewart himself had undertaken a Grand Tour lasting two years, which would no doubt have fed into his interest in art.[151] Ewart also had an interest in public education; he was instrumental in the Acts of 1845 and 1850 for museums and public libraries, and so was probably already 'on side' so to speak, when Haydon approached him regarding more widespread art education for the masses. It was Ewart who put forward the successful motion in parliament for a select committee on arts and manufactures, and Ewart who chaired sessions of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures as it commenced on 27 July 1835. As an MP, Ewart would more than likely have been aware of these previous select committees around trade and silk goods, even if he was not involved, and Haydon's petitioning to him may have come at an opportune moment to take advantage of the concerns around foreign trade.

The Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures (as it has come to be known) was set up and had sixteen sittings during the summer of 1835, and a further nineteen sittings between February and August 1836.[152] A total of 61 witnesses were interviewed during

[151] PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 75.
[152] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I – p. 6 & II p. b. The two Select Committee reports were published as: *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of*

committee sessions, including manufacturers, buyers, artists and principals of foreign art schools among others.[153] The remit of the Committee was rather broad. It was to 'inquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the ARTS and of the PRINCPLES OF DESIGN among the People (especially the Manufacturing Population) of the Country; also to inquire into the Constitution, Management and Effects of Institutions connected with the Arts'.[154] Witnesses were questioned on various issues including: the superiority of foreign designs; whether educating the public in art would increase the demand for British goods; whether schools of design would be beneficial to the nation; the benefits of museums and galleries; the situation at the RA; the state of the National Gallery; the issue of copyright and protection for designs; what should be taught to students in a school of design; whether the general taste of the nation could be raised through education in art; and whether there was an innate talent for art in the country or not. Witnesses were also not asked the exact same questions, though often questioning fell along broadly similar lines.

2.13 Benefits of a school of design: The improvement of taste

Many of the witnesses to the 1835-6 Select Committee were questioned regarding whether they thought a system of art education for the public would be beneficial, and were asked whether they thought this would be best achieved through a school of design, drawing being taught in elementary schools, or through increased access to museums and galleries and collections of art. One of the perceived benefits of such education, regardless of how it was delivered, was that the taste of nation would improve. As indicated earlier in the chapter, with the growing market for art and art objects came the concern that the general public did not have sufficient taste to distinguish between 'good' and 'bad' art, and this was one of the matters raised in the Select Committee. This issue of taste has been most notably focussed on by Mervyn Romans in his thesis

---

Evidence, Appendix (1835) HC 598 & *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568.

[153] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I – p. 6 & II p. b.

[154] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, p. ii. Capitalisation as per text.

and later articles where he notes that again and again during Select Committee sittings witnesses were questioned on the notion of 'taste' and how beneficial it would be to improve the public's taste in relation to art.[155] Romans argues that notions of taste and its relationship to consumerism and fashion within the context of expanding markets in the nineteenth century is an issue which needs further examination, especially given the recurrence of questions on taste during the Select Committee.[156] Reading the Select Committee report it is certainly clear where Romans' evidence for his argument comes from. When Benjamin Haydon was asked; 'Do you think if drawing was made a part of elementary instruction, the public taste would improve', he answered 'Yes; the taste of the people and the capacity of judging would be immensely increased'.[157] Another witness, James Morrison, thought that improving the taste of the people would result in them demanding better-designed goods. He was asked: 'You think that in proportion as you extend the taste of the community, that of course there would be a greater demand for those articles in which taste is envinced?' and answered 'Certainly'.[158]
These questions and answers regarding the notion of taste in relation to manufactures is, according to Romans, reflective of one of the definitions of taste during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; this was the idea of taste in relation to commerce.[159] In relation to art education and art for manufactures the thought was that the public taste

---

[155] M. Romans 'A Question of 'Taste': Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 41.

[156] M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Central England, 1998) p. 5.

[157] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, II - 1092-3. It appears in the report that the answers to questions 1092 and 1093 have been switched, as Haydon's answer to the question of taste refers to the preceding question, and makes more sense if swapped with the answer to question 1093.

[158] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I - 241. John Clinton Robertson, 'conductor' of the Mechanics' Magazine commented that; 'the more the taste of the country is improved, the more our manufactures will be improved; and the country that has the best manufactures will of course command the greatest trade in the long run', and in a similar manner, Thomas Field Gibson, a silk manufacturer from Spitalfields, answering a question about giving people the opportunity to see beautiful works of art, stated that 'I am of the opinion that if the general taste of the nation was improved it would be beneficial to our manufactures…'. *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix* (1835) HC 598, 1661 & *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I - 386.

[159] M. Romans 'A Question of 'Taste': Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century' in M. Romans (Ed.) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 42.

(likes and dislikes) was not very good; therefore, if the public were shown things of good taste (things of beauty), it would inspire them to buy and to produce better articles. Whilst this may have been an argument used in favour of art education and widening access to museums and galleries, Romans does not seem to take into account the fact that that French goods were considered superior in design to those from Britain and that the public preferred to purchase French designs, as demonstrated earlier in the chapter and evidenced in the Select Committee report. The argument may therefore have been more about educating people as to what good (British) taste was in order to improve purchases of British manufactures rather than good taste *per se*. It seems that 'British' taste was to be based on classical notions of beauty; notably works of art from Greece and Rome. One witness to the Committee, Charles Harriott Smith, was of the opinion that:

> Whatever deficiency of taste is displayed in our manufactures, arises…from …education in the arts…wherein classical design and execution forms an important feature.[160]

Smith also thought that the public had not been sufficiently educated to be able to determine the difference 'between pure classical elegance and meretricious finery'.[161] John Papworth, who became the first headmaster of the School of Design, when asked what he meant by classic or 'pure' art, answered 'Such works in ornamental art as were executed by the Grecians, Romans and Italians, and which have long been accredited as the offspring of high and cultivated taste'.[162] Good taste, then seems to have been based on the art of the ancient Greeks and Romans as well as the Italian masters, and this was later reflected in the curriculum of the School of Design, particularly in the National Curriculum of Cole and Redgrave which came into being in 1852.

---

[160] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I – 670.
[161] M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central England, 1998) p. 170.
[162] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

2.14 A potential curriculum

Witnesses before the Select Committee were questioned on whether a school of design was desirable and what the benefits of such a school could be, but were also questioned regarding what they thought a school of design should teach its students. Several of those questioned regarded drawing and perspective to be an important part of an artisan's education. James Morrison was asked if the 'cultivation of drawing' should form a portion of any art education and replied 'Undoubtedly; the use of pencil cannot be introduced too early'.[163] Similarly, the draftsman and artist Robert Stothard was asked if he would base the education of people in art on the principles of correct drawing; he replied simply 'Yes'.[164] Joseph Robertson, conductor of the 'Mechanics' Magazine' was asked if it would be an advantage to every mechanic to be able to draw, and replied 'I think it would be a great waste of time in any mechanic to learn an art he could not turn to some practical account…'.[165] There was a view though, that teaching drawing would only be useful as long as it could be applied to manufactures in some way. George Eld, then mayor of Coventry but acquainted with the riband trade noted that 'a mere drawing school would be of very little use, unless it were accompanied by lectures on the art of drawing and design, as applicable to manufactures, and as showing the means of transferring the design to the article to be produced'.[166] Samuel Wiley, from the japanning firm of Jennings and Betteridge in Birmingham also thought it necessary for the 'person who designs to be acquainted with the manufacturing branch of the business', though in his view, drawing and perspective should be taught first, and then manufacturing at a later stage.[167] Baron von Klenze, an architect and also Privy Councillor to the King of Bavaria, was asked if, 'For the purpose of instructing a manufacturer in the arts, is not necessary that the artist manufacturer should study the peculiar manufacture to which he is going to devote himself as well as the arts?' He replied 'Certainly', and then agreed that 'You must entirely unite the trade with the

---

[163] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I - 249.
[164] *Ibid.*, II - 285.
[165] *Ibid.*, I - 1591.
[166] *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix* (1835) HC 598, 500. 'Riband' was decorative ribbon.
[167] *Ibid.*, 803-7.

art'.[168] Robert Butt, superintendent of the bronze and porcelain department in a store in London was asked how a school of design would help manufacturers, and replied that it would enable 'young men to acquire a sufficient knowledge of the art of design', but would also enable apprentices in certain trades 'to acquire a knowledge of design, by agreement in their indentures to attend so many times per week at these schools, so that the study of the manipulation of their trades and the art of design might go hand in hand and bring both to perfection'.[169] There was then, a general feeling that what was taught at the school of design should have some application and relevance to manufacturing. One witness, the architect Thomas Donaldson, thought that a handling of materials would be useful for students. He was asked 'Do you think it desirable that experiments on the strength of materials should also be made for the instruction of workmen?' and replied:

> I think it very material, because that is a casual knowledge acquired generally by the experience of many years; whereas, if they were taught this at an earlier period, they would be enabled to avail themselves of that knowledge and bring it immediately into operation.[170]

He was then asked 'In materials of course you include all sorts of wood, stone and metals?' and answered 'Yes; also cement and mortars'.[171] Though only one witness to the Committee had advocated the handling of materials as part of the course that a student might follow at art school, this would seem to be an important part of any training which was to be applied by manufactures, and the fact that it was not introduced as part of the training once the school was founded, seems rather strange.

In addition to drawing, the application of art to manufactures and some handling of materials, other witnesses thought subjects such as anatomy, botany and chemistry might be useful to artisans.[172] The painter John Martin was asked if it was 'desirable

---

[168] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, II - 2262, 2265.
[169] *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix* (1835) HC 598, 583.
[170] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, II - 344.
[171] *Ibid.*, II - 345.
[172] George Foggo, the history painter, thought that it was necessary to be taught perspective, anatomy, proportion and perhaps botany; George Rennie considered that perspective, anatomy, a knowledge of proportion, botany and chemistry were important; James Skene though the opportunity to study in

that an artist should posses a knowledge of anatomy?' and replied 'Certainly, for the drawing of the human figure or animals'.[173] When asked whether the public could learn about these things merely from observation in a museum, Martin stated that: 'masters are necessary to give the proper direction to the pursuits of the student…'[174]

Witnesses to the Committee thought, variously, that it would be useful for students to be taught drawing, perspective, anatomy, proportion, botany, geometry, isometrical projection, geology, chemistry, landscape, architecture, ornamenting, and decoration – all of which should be based on Greek and Roman classical art as the standard of good taste. Students should also be given lectures on drawing and design, shown how to transfer a pattern to the material for which it was intended, be shown the strengths and weaknesses of various materials, and all the training should be, ideally, allied to the various trades that students were engaged in. While these were all sound ideas in theory, when the School of Design was founded the following year, the curriculum omitted many of these subjects, and often, subjects were brought in and phased out depending on who was in charge of the school, as will be shown in part three.

2.15 The outcome of the Committee

The Select Committee published its final report, together with the minutes of all sessions, in 1836. The first paragraph of the report states the main conclusion: 'the Committee advert with regret to the inference they are obliged to draw from the testimony they have received; that from the highest branches of poetical design down to the lowest connexion between design and manufactures, the Arts have received little encouragement in this country'.[175] The main recommendations of the Committee concerned art education, but the Committee also addressed other issues that affected or were affected by education. For example, museums and galleries were to be expanded;

---

botanical gardens from nature would be useful, while Thomas Donaldson thought that botany, geology, geometry and chemistry would be of use. See *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, I – 1129; I – 957; I – 1159; II – 343.

[173] *Ibid.*, I - 920.

[174] *Ibid.*, I - 924.

[175] *Ibid.*, p. iii.

these should be free and accessible after working hours so that the public would have access to view works of art and antiquity. The Committee also considered the situation of the Royal Academy and took into consideration all the evidence they had heard about it, much of it negative. While the Committee made no direct recommendations regarding the RA, it did note that 'the artists generally' were 'uneasy under the ambiguous, half-public half-private, character of the Academy; and they suggest that it should either stand in the simple position of a private institution, or, if it really represents the artists of Great Britain, that it should be responsible to, and eligible by them'.[176] Regarding the issue of some form of art education for the masses, the Committee thought it was desirable that 'the principles of design should form a portion of any permanent system of national education', which would be elementary education, based on 'the adoption of a bold style of geometrical and outline drawing, such as is practiced in the national schools of Bavaria'.[177] The Committee were not sure how this would work in practice, but thought a minister for Education might be appointed to look into the matter, as it was not an issue over which they had any direct influence.

Where the Committee *did* have some influence, and most pertinently for this thesis, was in the matter of art as applied to manufacture. Following the Committee's opening statement that the arts had been much neglected in Britain, various trades were also noted as being 'deficient' in the area of design, most notably the silk trade, ribbon manufacture, the china trade, and interior decoration and furniture.[178] It was clear that something had to be done, as the Committee reported: 'Yet, to us, a peculiarly manufacturing nation, the connexion between art and manufactures is most important…it equally imports us to encourage art in its loftier attributes; since it is

[176] *Ibid.*, p. ix.
[177] *Ibid.*, p. vii.
[178] The house decorator George Morant was asked during a Committee session: 'Is there not great confusion observed in the several styles in England in decoration, both for furniture and rooms?' He replied that the confusion was 'very great, generally', but that there was a desire to remedy this', while The architect John Papworth was asked if there was 'sufficient intelligence in art exhibited in such works as furniture in this country?' and answered: 'I think not, unless designed by the architect himself. If he will not give his attention to it, the taste of furniture is not good in this country, or not so good as it might be.' He was also asked if there was a 'want of knowledge of body and of form and combination and of accuracy' in the furniture of London houses, and replied that 'I think there is; indeed I know there is a great want of clever designers in that (furniture) as in other departments'. See *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index*, (1836) HC 568, II – 560; I – 1305 & 1310 (brackets mine).

admitted that the cultivation of the more exalted branches of design tends to advance the humblest pursuits of industry...'[179]

The Committee noted the general conclusion of witnesses that foreign manufacturing artists were at an advantage over British workers because of the 'greater extension of art throughout the mass of society abroad'.[180] They also noted the importance of schools of design in France, Bavaria and Prussia, as well as the accessibility of museums, libraries and exhibitions so that the public could acquaint themselves with works of art. The most important recommendation made by the Committee of relevance to this thesis was the proposition that a school of design be founded in England, and the Committee stated that: 'His Majesty's Government has this year, for the first time, proposed a vote in the Estimates for the establishment of a Normal School of Design'.[181] The Committee were clear that 'in the formation of such an institution, not mere theoretical instruction only, but the direct practical application of the Arts to Manufactures ought to be deemed an essential element'.[182] Local art schools were also envisioned by the Committee, as these, situated 'where the Arts reside as it were with the manufacture to which they are devoted, appear to possess many practical advantages'.[183] It was not clear, at this point, how the system would work, whether local art schools would operate independently or using some central system, for example, but the Committee thought that if a more central system were to be adopted – emanating from the Normal School in London, 'the inventive power of the artist ought equally be brought to bear on the special manufacture which he is destined to hereafter to pursue'.[184] As the report went on to note; 'Unless the Arts and Manufactures be practically combined, the unsuccessful aspirants after the higher branches of the Arts will be minutely multiplied and the deficiency of manufacturing artists will not be supplied'.[185] It seems the idea of a school of design was that students were to be taught more than just the principles of drawing *per se*, but it is unclear as to whether this meant they were to be taught drawing with

[179] *Ibid.*, p. iii.
[180] *Ibid.*, p. iv.
[181] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[182] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[183] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[184] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[185] *Ibid.*, p. v.

regards to a particular manufacture but have no practical experience of working with the material they were designing for, or if the chance to actually work *with* rather than design *for* those materials was what the Committee had intended.

In 1836, the House of Commons agreed to give the Board of Trade £1,500 for the establishment of a Normal School of Design in London, and discussions started regarding the aims and curriculum of the school. The School was to come under the control of the Board of Trade, possibly because the government at the time felt that the matter of a school of design related directly to industry, but there was also no Ministry or Board of Education in existence at the time. The first meeting regarding the School was held in December 1836, and of twenty men invited, only seven attended; four Royal Academicians, one an MP and ceramics manufacturer, one a glass manufacturer and one a barrister.[186] This small group was the beginnings of the Council of the School of Design, and formed two committees; one, made up of the four Academicians and the barrister Bellenden Ker to consider the curriculum, and the other comprising only the four men from the RA, to deal with the issue of which casts and books the School would need.[187] Bearing in mind the aim of the School was to be the application of arts to manufactures, it seems remiss that neither of the manufacturers were appointed to either committee, particularly the one dealing with the curriculum. The first meeting, on 19 December 1836, was, as Bellenden Ker put it, to 'settle the principle of the thing', and a report was agreed which laid out the aim and initial curriculum of the School.[188] The object of the proposed school was stated as being 'to afford the manufacturers an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the fine arts, as far as the same are concerned with manufactures'.[189] In order for this to be achieved, it was felt that students should be taught not only drawing, but should be 'acquainted with the principles and modes of changing and combining fine forms or ornament, aided by light,

---

[186] C. Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 14.
[187] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[188] *Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1864) HC 466, p. xii, & Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963), p. 67.
[189] *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Government School of Design* vol. 1, p. 411 cited in *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index*, (1849) HC 576, p. xii

shade, and colour, less by copying than by original arrangement and composition, adopting nature as the model, and the best works of established art in ornament, as guides towards successful imitation'.[190]

The School of Design opened in June 1837, and was dogged from the start by discussion and debate about what its aim was and what (and who) it should teach. Bell stated that:

> It may be doubted whether we have ever decided just what it is that our art schools are to do. Certainly at the time of their inception, their purpose was very ill-defined,

though given that the object of the School as stated in 1836 was fairly clear, Bell's comment is perhaps rather inaccurate.[191]

This chapter has demonstrated that an examination of the 1835-6 Select Committee report together with the work of other scholars, reveals that rather than one single reason leading to the Select Committee it was in fact a multiplicity of reasons which led, ultimately to the foundation of the School of Design. The factors included concerns over the superiority of foreign goods and the public's preference for them over British goods; the state of the Royal Academy; an increasing interest in art on the part of the public; the moral value of art; the desire to educate the public in art and discussions about how this should be done, and whether an education in art would be beneficial to manufactures. With all of these factors at play in the foundation of the School of Design, it is unsurprising that there was no clear decision as to how a knowledge of the fine arts as applied to manufactures should be taught to students. Bell's comment above would be more precise had it suggested that while the aim of the School of Design may have been clear in the minds of those in charge, it seems that the way this aim was to be achieved was less clear, and it was the method, rather than the aim itself, that proved to be problematic, as will be demonstrated in chapter three.

---

[190] *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Government School of Design* vol. 1, p. 411 *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index*, (1849) HC 576, p. xii.

[191] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 67.

Chapter three: The schools of design from 1837 - 1910

3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the situation which prevailed from 1837 to c1910 after the founding of the School of Design in 1837. It was agreed that art should be applied to manufactures and that artisans would benefit from some knowledge of art, but, this chapter will demonstrate there were varying opinions as to how art and the principles of design should be taught. Was design something to be originated by artisans, or were they merely to mechanically copy classical forms and apply them to ornament? As chapter two has demonstrated, there was a multiplicity of issues which led to the Select Committee of 1835-6, and also a number of issues raised within that Committee concerning art education and how best to spread this to the masses. This chapter argues that these issues were then manifested in differing opinions regarding the aim of the schools of design, but more importantly, on the methods used to achieve those aims. As the chapter demonstrates, while there were differences of opinion on the aims of the schools of design, these differences were closer and more resolvable than opinion on how to teach students in order that those aims might be achieved. In other words, there was general agreement on the direction of the schools, less so on how to get there. This chapter also argues that while the early years of the school may have been considered an experiment, with teaching at the School of Design changing emphasis from fine art to practical work and back to fine art again, this was not as adverse an impact on art education overall than was the intervention of Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave and their National Course of Instruction for the Schools of Design, which effectively steered art education away from any utility to manufactures for more than fifty years.

This chapter examines the history of the School of Design in London from 1837 onwards, but also covers the foundation of both Birmingham and Leicester schools of design. In exploring the foundations of these two schools, the chapter also demonstrates that while it seems to have been the intention of those on the Select Committee of 1835-6 to have a system of schools of design around the country, it was for individual towns

and cities to both desire and propose that a school be founded in their location. The government would then approve the application and provide finances, but the impetus for a school of design had to come from those in the town. While it would seem better that the desire for a school of design should come from within the town rather than Government, local tensions and politics could, as in the case of Leicester, lead to the process of founding a school of design being rather drawn out. The case studies of Birmingham and Leicester also serve as examples of the way local schools of design were affected by events in London, particularly the introduction of Cole and Redgrave's National Course of Instruction, and were often hindered in their efforts to introduce practical work for their students.

3.2 An experimental beginning: The early years of the School in London

The Normal, or Head School of Design opened on 1 June 1837, in rooms at Somerset House, with 12 students, and the architect and artist John Papworth as Head.[192] Classes were to be held from 10am to 4pm, but it was quickly realised that those for whom the school was intended – the artisans – were in employment during the day and could only attend the School in the evenings, so on 1 August the School started an evening class which ran from 6-9pm and allowed artisans to attend after work.[193] Regarding the curriculum of the School the 1841 report of the Provisional Council of the School noted that 'In the absence of any example in this country of a school of a similar nature to that, the management of which had been intrusted to their care, they felt it difficult for them to decide on the particular form of instruction which its object demanded'.[194]

No system of art education as applied to manufactures had ever been attempted before; no one was sure what the teaching of art as applied to manufactures should entail, and no one on the Council had any educational experience. As Frayling comments, the majority of the Council members thought that training at the School should be different

[192] *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere, MP., &c. &c. &c., President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design; 2 February 1841*. (1841) HC 65, p. 2.
[193] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[194] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

from the fine art training given at the Royal Academy (RA) – and this was indeed the aim of the School as seen from the 1836 Select Committee report. However, the question of *how* it should be different was not entirely clear.[195] Frayling goes on to comment that the School was, in effect, nothing more than an experiment, 'for no one seems to have had any idea of what it was to teach'.[196] There was a Committee of Instruction of the School which was composed primarily of Royal Academicians who made sure that instruction at the School of Design would not overlap with any of the Academy's own teaching.[197] This Committee was apparently very clear on several issues: architectural detail, vases, scroll-work, geometrical design or studies of vegetables were all considered appropriate for artisans to study; the study of the human figure was not.[198] The Royal Academy was the place for fine art to be taught; the human figure was idealised as the only subject worthy of study and certainly did not have a place in a school of design.[199] Elements of the curriculum of the School of Design seem to have been decided on a negative basis – what was *not* to be taught, rather than what *was* considered suitable for students of design. As Bell comments, it was if the Council of the School of Design was effectively saying:

> We will give you half an education, but not more; we will not see whether you are able to rise, but will assume that you cannot do so and will close the doors of opportunity at that point in your career which seems to us appropriate. We know best for what occupation you are fitted and we shall take steps to see that you have no chance to enter any other.[200]

This 'half an education' reflected, suggests Bell, a view that while it may have seemed unfair to dissuade students from becoming fine artists, it was actually worse to encourage students towards fine art – a profession in which there were few prospects of making a good living – when ornamental artists were much more necessary.[201] However rather than provide students with the sort of training that would ensure better job prospects once they left the School, Bell notes that the Council did not do much more

---

[195] Q. Bell, T*he Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 67.
[196] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 6.
[197] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[198] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[199] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 2-3. The 'History Painting' was not a direct representation of an event, but the interpretation of it, showing history as it *should* have been.
[200] *Ibid.*, p. 69-70.
[201] *Ibid.*, p. 68-9.

than forbid the teaching of certain subjects which might put ideas into a student's head and encourage them to become fine artists rather than ornamental artists.[202] The RA was keen to protect its status as the keeper of fine art and guardian of the Academic Idea, and the Academicians on the Committee of Instruction were clear in their views that artisans should not be taught anything related to fine art. Bell comments that 'the purpose of the schools was emphatically not to produce artists but rather to form the taste of artisans', and goes on to reiterate the point, saying:

> It was the business of the School to supply industry. It was not a school of art, It was a school of design.[203]

While Bell is correct in his assertion that the School of Design was to form the taste of artisans, as has been demonstrated from the 1836 Select Committee report, he is not entirely correct in saying that it was the business of the School to supply industry. The School was set up with the intention of educating artisans who were working in manufactures so there is more of a sense of improvement of an existing situation rather than 'ready supply of trained workers specifically for manufactures' which Bell's comment seems to imply.

The first students at the School were initially to take Elementary Outline Drawing, which included shading from plaster, modelling and colouring.[204] Then they would go on to 'Instruction for design in special branches of industry' which was split into two sections: firstly a study of the fabrics and processes of industry, and secondly the study of history and taste and theoretical knowledge.[205] It is not clear what is meant by the phrase 'fabrics and processes of industry'; today that would imply at least some form of practical work and/or knowledge of industrial processes, but it seems that this was not the case in 1837, as the first reported practical work done by the students was not until 1838 when William Dyce became Head of the School. Towards the end of the first year numbers attending the School during the day were very small; even the evening class,

---

[202] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[203] *Ibid.*, p. 67-8.
[204] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[205] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

which was more popular, had just 45 students.[206] A review of the School was undertaken, and it was at this point that the Council of the School decided to replace Papworth with the Scottish painter William Dyce.

3.3 A first attempt at practical work

Dyce's views on art and art education were known to the Council of the School through a pamphlet he had written along with Charles Heath Wilson, *On the best means of ameliorating the arts and manufactures of Scotland*.[207] This pamphlet had been published by the Board of Trustees of the Royal Scottish Academy, which sent fifty copies of it to the Council of the School of Design at Somerset House, who liked Dyce's views and wanted to bring him to London to take charge of the School of Design. Like those on the 1835-6 Select Committee, Dyce was of the opinion that:

> the institution should be enabled not only to hold out the advantage of a complete education in art, but become a source from whence the manufacturing classes should have it at all times in their power to obtain pure and excellent designs for their various purposes, as well as designers thoroughly instructed in its true principles. It is extremely necessary, that, during the progressive studies of the pupils, distinct reference should be had to their ultimate employments in life.[208]

Although Dyce was keen on concentrating on art for manufactures and thought that any training a student undertook should be related to their ultimate intended employment; he also thought it was 'extremely foolish in many cases' to allow students to desire to become fine artists.[209] Before he took up his position as head of the School, Dyce went to Prussia, Bavaria and France to observe their methods of teaching art and was impressed by the systems of education in both Prussia and Bavaria which were very practically oriented. He wrote that:

---

[206] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 17.
[207] W. Dyce & C Heath Wilson *Letter to Lord Meadowbank, and the committee of the Honourable Board of Trustees for the encouragement of arts and manufactures: on the best means of ameliorating the arts and manufactures of Scotland in point of taste* (Edinburgh, 1837).
[208] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 81-2.
[209] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

> Design and manufacture are the elements which are to be brought together. The foreign schools of design deal with artists or designers as if they were to become workmen, and with the workmen as if they intended to be artists: the designer is brought down to the level of the workman by the practical study of industry, and the workman is elevated to the level of the artist by the study of art.[210]

Although the Select Committee of 1835-6 had heard the evidence of one Gustaav Wagens, Director of the Royal Gallery in Berlin, regarding schools of design in Berlin and Bavaria more widely, it seems they were slow to adopt any practices from the continent which could have been useful in Britain.[211] Bearing in mind that art education in France and Bavaria was already widespread, and French goods were considered superior to those in Britain, it seems odd that methods used in France and Bavaria had not been observed before the School was set up.

In June 1838 Dyce became Superintendent of the Normal School of Design in London, and was, according to Strand, keen to make the School not so much a studio but more a workshop to produce patterns which could then be supplied to manufacturers.[212] He asked that 'the human figure for the purposes of ornament be taught in the School', and in August 1838, in a seeming about-face given their previous insistence that the human figure was not to be studied, the Council agreed. The 1841 *Report of the Provisional Council etc.*, makes reference to Dyce's trip abroad and subsequent alterations to the curriculum of the School, noting that: 'They, therefore, took means of ascertaining what was done in various continental schools of design; and by a comparison of the merits of the several plans and modes of operation adopted in these schools, they have authorized a plan of tuition which they hope will answer the ends they have in view...'[213]

The system of instruction which Dyce proposed and which was approved by the Council, divided instruction into two sections. The first was Elementary instruction,

---

[210] Cited in C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 18.
[211] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I paras. 1-98.
[212] R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (Council for National Academic Awards, 1987) p. 2 & Q. Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 81.
[213] *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere, MP., &c. &c. &c., President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design; 2 February 1841* (1841) HC 65, p 1.

'embracing the usual branches of study; viz. outline drawing of ornament and of the human figure, shadowing, drawing from plaster, modelling and colouring'.[214] The second portion of study was 'Instruction in design for special branches of industry', which was comprised of:

> 1st, The study of fabrics, and of processes of industry as admit only of the application of design under certain conditions; and 2nd, The study of the history of taste in manufacture, the distinction of styles of ornament, and such theoretical knowledge as is calculated to improve the tastes of the pupils and add to their general acquaintance with art.[215]

The only practical training at the School at that time was the study of the manufacture of silk, in spite of the Select Committee report's recommendation that advocated 'not mere theoretical instruction only, but the direct application of art to manufactures'.[216] The 1841 report stated that 'the Council have not thought it expedient to introduce the practical study of any manufacture but that of silk', to which end a loom and Jacquard machine had been purchased, and a weaving teacher brought in to give lessons twice a week.[217] This class was, to quote Frayling, 'a total failure', and the 1842 report states that 'numbers attending it being so small as scarcely to warrant the cost of tuition', which must have been disappointing to Dyce.[218] Regarding design for manufactures, this appears to have taken the form of lectures only; the 1841 report states that:

> For the second section of the classes of design for manufacture…besides the instructions of the kind referred to…he shall give twelve lectures during the year; and that qualified lecturers shall be appointed to give oral instruction on particular subjects connected with the purposes of the institution…[219]

It seems then, that apart from the short-lived weaving class, there was no other practical instruction being given at the School. So few students were interested, that instruction was stopped, and it wasn't until 1849 that the School purchased more equipment for

---

[214] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[215] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[216] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, p. v.
[217] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[218] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 19 & *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere, MP., &c. &c. &c., President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design; 2 February 1841* (1841) HC 65, p. 2.
[219] *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere, MP., &c. &c. &c., President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design; 2 February 1841* (1841) HC 65, p. 2.

practical work.[220] Dyce had at least attempted to bring more practical training to the School of Design, which was in accordance with the general aims of the School and the view of the Select Committee of 1835-6. The School was to be of service to manufactures, but at this early point in its history training consisted of drawing exercises, with no practical or experimental work. While it is true that no school of this type had been in existence in Britain and thus the School of Design was always going to be an experiment of sorts, it can be argued that it was remiss of those initially in charge of a School which was to benefit manufactures (making things) to not give their students the chance to practice making things during their training. There may have been the view that as many of those attending the School were already working in manufacture and were getting all the practical experience they needed in their employment, the School of Design existed merely to influence their taste through art in order that they might then go into the workplace and produce more tasteful better-designed goods. There were also the differing views of those who felt that a study of the principles of art was all that was necessary - once a student had grasped these they could then be applied to any material or manufacture - and those, like Dyce, who felt that a student's training did have to have at least some practical elements to it and be related to the job they were intending to do.

During the 1835-6 Select Committee witnesses had commented on the fact that artisans in their various towns were eager for instruction in art and the Committee had possibly envisaged a system of branch schools throughout the country.[221] In 1842 a plan was put forward by the Council of the School of Design with regards to Provincial Schools of Design and money was given by Parliament for the setting up of such schools and for the purchase of (plaster) casts.[222] A year later design schools in towns and cities were beginning to be formed and the Council of the School were keen that all students should be instructed in the same taste and styles of ornament as students in London.[223] To that

[220] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 19.
[221] See *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I – 493 for the example of Coventry, and II – 71 regarding Birmingham, Worcester, Wolverhampton and Kidderminster.
[222] *Report of the Council of the School of Design 1842-3* (1843) HC 454, p 8.
[223] See appendix 3 for list of foundation dates of provincial schools of art.

end William Dyce had put together a 'work of ornamental design' which was to serve as a sort of textbook of examples of 'styles of ornament for the instruction of designers…to be used in the Government school and for provincial institutions of a like nature'.[224] Classes at the School of Design were now split into three sections; the full curriculum is worth noting below:

Elementary Instruction

I. Drawing
1. Outline drawing
Geometrical Drawing
Freehand ditto
2. Shadowing, the use of Chalks, &c.
3. Drawing from the Round
4. Drawing from Nature

II. Modelling
Modelling from the Antique, &c.
Ditto from Nature.

III. Colouring
1. Instruction in the use of Colours
Water-colours, including Water Body-colours and Fresco
Oil colours
2. Copies of Coloured Drawings
3. Colouring from Nature

N.B Instructions in Colouring are given only in the Morning School

Instruction in the History, Principles, and Practice of Ornamental Art

This section will embrace, according to circumstances, the Study of
1. The Antique Styles
2. Styles of the Middle Ages
3. Modern Styles

Instruction in Design for Manufactures

1. Study of the various Processes of Manufactures so far as may be requisite, including those of Silk and Carpet Weaving, Calico Printing, Paper Staining, &c. &c. &c.
2. The Practice of Design for individual Branches of Industry
1. Subject considered generally
2. With reference to the prevailing modes [225]

While the last section of the curriculum would seem to be the most practical in terms of application to industry, it appears that after Dyce's experiment with the loom and Jacquard machine, that there was no practical work undertaken at the school at all. The

[224] *Report made to the Right honourable Henry Labouchere, MP., &c. &c. &c., President of the Board of Trade, by the Provisional Council of the School of Design; 2 February 1841* (1841) HC 65, p. 3.
[225] *Ibid.*, p. 4-5.

study of processes of manufacture seems to have been undertaken entirely via lectures.[226] Copies of Dyce's textbook were sent to all the provincial schools of design; one of which was in Birmingham.

3.4 The foundation of Birmingham School of Design

Birmingham was one of the first branch schools of design to be set up; as the 1843 report states 'The Council did not hesitate to decide that Manchester and Birmingham had the first claim on their attention – the former as the metropolis of British manufactures and the latter as the chief seat of a large branch of industry, comprising works of fancy and of taste'.[227] John Swift writes that the development of art and design education and the founding of the school of design in Birmingham has to be seen within the context of Birmingham as it grew from a village, to a town and then a city, developing into one of the largest and richest industrial centres in England.[228] As Swift argues, the view has often been taken that all art and design education emanated from London, but this is not the whole story, and ignores local issues in towns around the country, where art schools were set up for a variety of different reasons although they did come under the umbrella of the Board of Trade and eventually followed the 'national curriculum' set out by Cole and Redgrave.[229] Cunningham, like Swift, also suggests that art schools around the country were founded for a variety of local reasons; economic, educational, and philanthropic. He writes that during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, various cultural and educational activities were taking place in Birmingham, and the foundation of the art school was as much part of an increasing cultural awareness in the city as a response to an industrial demand for art education.[230]

---

[226] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, I – p v.
[227] *Report of the Council of the School of Design 1842-3*, London, HMSO, 1843., p. 9.
[228] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans, (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 68.
[229] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[230] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 215. Cunningham cites the Lunar Society, the subscription library, the Artisans' Library, Sunday Schools, the Philosophical Society, a Mechanics' Institution, the Botanical and Horticultural Society, the Law Library

While it can be argued that the ultimate impetus for branch schools of design in towns and cities around the country came from a variety of local reasons, it is evident that the Council of the School of Design in London already had plans to establish branch schools. Additionally, the 1843 report makes reference to 'the selection of the towns in which Provincial Schools should be established' and also notes that 'some peculiar circumstances which had interfered with our establishing a School of Design in Birmingham'.[231] There is, then, evidence to suggest that in Birmingham's case, art and design education in that city did emanate from London to some degree, though the establishment of regional schools of design was often achieved with the co-operation of local art societies and institutions, and this was the case in Birmingham. It would be true to say that in the case of Birmingham, while the initial proposal for a school of design came from the Council of the School of Design in London, there had to be local agreement and desire, and as Swift and Cunningham suggest, it is these local reasons which vary from town to town.

Design for manufactures does not appear to have been an unknown concept in Birmingham prior to the school of design being founded there. Cunningham writes that during the eighteenth century local manufacturers such as Matthew Boulton, Josiah Wedgwood, John Baskerville and Francis Eginton were all known to have procured designs from artists to apply to their products, though these were manufacturers who had larger factories and could probably afford to pay artists for their designs.[232] Industry in Birmingham during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was primarily centred around small workshops rather than larger factories and while this led to many skilled workers who produced an enormous variety of wares, it also resulted in a large number of workers who were able to both design products and to produce and interpret drawings of those designs.[233] This proliferation of small enterprises in Birmingham together with large numbers of skilled workers who were capable of producing their

---

and the Birmingham Statistical Society for the Improvement of Education as examples of cultural activities which were in existence in Birmingham by 1840. See Cunningham pp. 207-213.

[231] *Report of the Council of the School of Design 1842-3* (1843) HC 454, pp. 8-9 & 13.

[232] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 190.

[233] *Ibid.*, p. 68 & J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans, (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 68.

own designs for goods may well have rendered an art school largely unnecessary, and manufacturers working from their own home or small workshop would not necessarily have been able to afford to purchase designs created by someone else.

However, drawing had been taught in Birmingham prior to the foundation of the school of design in 1843; as Cunningham writes, the city 'enjoyed the tradition of several pioneering attempts to apply ornamentation to industrial production'.[234] He goes on to note that 'in 1760 there were perhaps two or three drawing schools, and Boulton set up his own design school at Soho'.[235] Both the Sunday Society and Brotherly Society included drawing in their subjects of instruction, and Joseph Barber and Samuel Lines had set up their own schools of drawing in 1801 and 1807 respectively; Lines' school included 'drawing from casts as well as from copies'.[236] Some of Lines' pupils reportedly became designers in Birmingham and had success at the Great Exhibition of 1851.[237] Those associated with Lines' school eventually started exhibiting their work under the name of the Birmingham Academy of Arts, which was formed in 1814 and encouraged the 'embellishment of manufactures'.[238] This group later became the Birmingham Society of Arts, which started in 1821 and from which was founded the school of design in Birmingham.[239] There was some teaching undertaken by the Society of Arts, but according to Cunningham this was conducted along the lines of an academy of fine art and included lectures on anatomy for the fine arts, as well as studies of the antique and linear perspective, but there was reportedly no connection between the teaching and industrial arts.[240] Charles Cockerell, architect to the Bank of England, and a man who had visited Birmingham from time to time, also commented on this to the 1835-6 Select Committee. He noted that the activities of the Society of Arts in

---

[234] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p 190.
[235] *Ibid.*, p. 230.
[236] *Ibid.*, p. 230, & J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 69.
[237] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 69.
[238] J. Langford *Modern Birmingham and its Institutions* vol. 1 (Osborne, 1873) p 190, cited in *Ibid.*, p. 69. Also http://www.rbsa.org.uk/about-us/history/ - accessed 22/8/13.
[239] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p 69.
[240] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p 231-2.

Birmingham generally took the form of 'fine art and annual exhibitions; they have not been able to bring them to bear more directly on manufactures to such an extent as they would otherwise have done'.[241] Augustus Pugin, who lived in the city during the 1840s, evidently did not see any improvement in Birmingham's manufactures, calling design in the city 'deplorable', with the efforts of those to teach drawing to workers and so to improve manufactures appearing to have had little effect.[242] The quantity and variety of manufacturers in Birmingham created, according to Cunningham, a 'considerable potential demand for design training', but it was also the system of small workshops that worked against the foundation and funding of an art school in the city.[243] Any funding for an art school would have to come from subscriptions, and Bell notes that though there was plenty of money in Birmingham, it was 'distributed in the hands of a great many self-made men, the masters of fairly small enterprises, and there were not, as in Manchester, great magnates who could be touched for a large subscription'.[244] Thomas Howells, one of the witnesses to the 1835-6 Select Committee, was a factory inspector in the West Midlands area, and, knowing he was going to be testifying before the Committee in 1836 had visited various factories in order to 'show the present state of the arts, as applicable to the manufactures of those places'.[245] Howells found that among 'operatives' in Birmingham there was a strong desire for instruction in art but there was not, at present, much opportunity for such instruction in the city.[246] Among the master manufacturers however, Howell found there was not quite so much enthusiasm for instruction, though the overall feeling was that a greater knowledge of the arts could be of general benefit to manufacturers.[247] Jennens and Betteridge, the Birmingham japanning firm, already taught their apprentices in the art of drawing, as testified to at the Select Committee by Samuel Wiley, an employee of the firm.[248] In spite of already providing training to their apprentices the firm was keen to see some

---

[241] Cited in *Ibid.,* p. 204.
[242] J. Swift 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921' in M. Romans (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol, 2005) p. 69.
[243] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, thesis, 1979) p. 194.
[244] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p 104.
[245] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, II - 69.
[246] *Ibid.,* II – 71.
[247] *Ibid.,* II – 74.
[248] *Ibid.,* I – 751.

form of more formal art training in the city. Howells, who had visited Jennens and Betteridge, reported to the Select Committee that the firm was 'extremely anxious for any institution that the state might furnish that would encourage art in Birmingham, with reference to their own particular manufacture'.[249] The general impression given to the Select Committee was that any art learnt in Birmingham happened in the larger factories and workshops rather than in any formal setting such as an art school. Cunningham notes that manufacturers were not always willing to back an art school if they could not see how it would benefit their business.[250] It seems that while there was a desire on the part of workers to receive some form of art education that could be applied to industry, and while some larger firms such as Jennens and Betteridge recognised the value of educating their employees in art, there was not sufficient desire from a large enough body of manufacturers to come together and fund an art school for the city.

By the 1840s, however, some of members of the Society of Arts realised that a Government supported school of design, similar to the one in London, might enable it to continue to develop its endeavours in Birmingham. As the Council of the School in London noted, the existence of the Society of Arts constituted 'unusual facilities for accomplishing the objects which we had in view', for as well as encouraging the arts in Birmingham, the Society also possessed a small collection of works of arts and casts, all of which could serve to instruct students in a school of design in the city.[251] The Society of Arts in Birmingham, however, had quite a large mortgage debt, and thus its funds were 'insufficient to carry on a School of Design in a manner adequate to the wants of Birmingham', and so the Society applied for a grant towards the aim of setting up a school of design.[252] There were also internal disputes within the Society of Arts: it had been run by two committees, one of subscribers to the Society, and one of artists, though this had proved so inconvenient that the two had been dissolved and just one joint committee comprised of both subscribers and artists had been formed, much to the

[249] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[250] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leeds, 1979) p. 189.
[251] *Report of the Council of the School of Design 1842-3* (1843) HC 454, p. 13. Although the annual reports were produced by the Council of the School in London, they contained reports from each of the provincial schools in addition to a report from the London School and information regarding the overall picture of art education in the country.
[252] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

displeasure of the artists who had left the Society and started their own institution.[253] This had caused some concern in London, as the Council of the School of Design noted: 'we entertained great doubts whether it would be possible for us to place ourselves in connexion with the Society of Arts at Birmingham without aggravating the existing disputes and misunderstanding, and without involving ourselves in controversy and perhaps in litigation'.[254]

The Council were keen to set up a school of design in Birmingham, but were not willing to become involved in local disputes within the Society of Arts. They were, however, prepared to fund a school in Birmingham if the Society of Arts made a school of design its 'sole object' and was prepared to 'subscribe to the conditions which we required from other Schools'.[255] The Society of Arts was told that funding would only be offered if they restricted their school to the 'province of ornamental art, as distinguished from that of Fine Art…' and were reminded that 'the School is intended for the improvement of taste in patterns and designs for the prevailing manufactures of the district…'.[256] The Society of Arts acquiesced, even though this meant there would no longer be any institution offering instruction in fine art in the city, and the Birmingham branch school of design opened in 1843.

From the outset the Birmingham school appears to have been successful; Cunningham noted that it had the highest recruitment and lowest drop-out rate of all of the seven regional schools of design in existence at the time.[257] The *Third Report from the Council of the Schools of Design for the year 1843-4* states that in 1844 the Birmingham School of Art had 168 male and 48 female students on the books; this was more than at any other branch school at the time. The Birmingham school followed the curricula of the London School, and classes were held in 'Outline Drawing of Ornament

---

[253] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[254] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[255] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[256] *Birmingham IV* (Minute book of the Birmingham Society of Arts) (1842-4) p. 83; General conditions enjoined by the Council relative to the establishment, maintenance and management of Provincial Schools, article 21, *Birmingham V* (Minute book of the Birmingham Society of Arts) (1844-6), p. 32, both cited in Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963), p. 105.
[257] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (unpublished PhD thesis University of Leeds, 1979) p. 241.

in Pencil; Shading; Use of Chalks, etc; Modelling, from Casts and Nature; Drawing from Casts of Ornament; Elementary Colouring; Copying from Coloured Drawings &c.; Colouring from Nature; Figure drawing'.[258] The Council of the School of Design states in their *Third Report etc*., regarding Manchester and Birmingham's branch schools, that 'the present successful progress of their operations warrants an expression of unqualified satisfaction'.[259] There was no mention in the report of any improvement to Birmingham's manufactures – presumably it was too early tell as the school had only been in operation for a year – but it seems that the rather smug statement of the success of the school was as a result of numbers attending, rather than contribution to manufactures in the city. By 1846 there was more opportunity to comment on the contribution of the school to local manufactures; the report of the Committee of the School of Design for that year noted the 'increased usefulness of the School, as bearing on the manufactures and general taste, as well as the mental and moral improvement of a considerable number of the inhabitants of the town'.[260] The *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6* states that 'All the classes are crowded; and although the premises are spacious, and were originally designed for public use; much inconvenience is experienced, under the present arrangement, from want of adequate space to conduct the business of instruction'.[261] Bell notes that some of the trades in which students at the school were engaged included modellers and designers, die sinkers, japanners, platers, architects, jewellers, lamp manufacturers, lithographers, carvers and gilders, upholsterers, snuff box makers, school teachers, engravers and printers.[262] The largest numbers of students attending the school were those engaged in die-sinking, japanning and engraving, though from the wide range of other trades in which students were engaged it is hard to know what the prevailing manufactures of the district were and therefore which were supposed to influence the tuition of the school. Indeed the *Fifth Report…etc.*, noted that: 'One manufacturer in the japanning trade is report to have had at one time in the School as many as sixteen of his

---

[258] *Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1843-4* (1844) HC 566, p. 29.
[259] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[260] P. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* (Unpublished PhD thesis University of Leeds, 1979) p. 242.
[261] *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6* (1846) HC 730, p. 19.
[262] *Minutes of the Birmingham Society of* Arts, V, p 111. Cited in Q. Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 106.

workplace; and a belief is found to prevail, that the manufacturers, in bestowing employment, show a preference for those who have given evidence of qualification as Students in the School'.[263]

The Birmingham branch school appears to have attracted large numbers of students in its early years; even if the effect on local manufactures could not be accurately judged at that point, the school was at least successful in beginning to educate workers in art. The Government's desire to educate the artisans of the country in the principles of art and design appeared to be becoming a reality as branch schools around the country opened, and students started to attend. In Birmingham at least, the wide range of trades in which students were involved suggests a desire - at least on the part of the workers if not the manufacturers themselves – for instruction in art, and from the evidence above it seems that manufacturers preferred to employ those who had attended the school. While the curriculum may not have included any practical work, it appears that there were benefits to having had some instruction in art and that in Birmingham this was recognised. In the London School, however, things were not running as smoothly.

3.5 Problems in London: Heath Wilson's course of instruction

In 1843 Dyce resigned as Superintendent of the Normal School of Design in London and on 1 May, Charles Heath Wilson was appointed in his place. At that time, there were 26 students in attendance in the mornings, and 220 in the evenings, receiving instruction in elementary, geometrical and freehand drawing, drawing from nature and the round, and modelling and colouring.[264] The role of superintendent seems to have been changed to director, and the Council of the School drew up a new contract of duties for the director, the first of which was 'To suggest, for the consideration of the Council, a systematic course of instruction for each of the classes in the Schools…', even though a curriculum had been instituted previously as a result of the founding of

[263] *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6* (1846) HC 730, p. 19.
[264] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London 1963) p. 148.

the branch schools.[265] Heath Wilson divided students into elementary drawing and 'other' classes, with each student being placed, as far as possible, in the class most relevant to their needs.[266] On admittance to the School, each student was to start with the class for Elementary Drawing in Outline, which 'he is not to leave until he can draw with correctness'.[267] From this class students would then move on to the Shading class, firstly shading from the flat, which should not be done with any style or manner, but by 'truthful imitation and correct design'.[268] After the Shading class, students would move on to drawing from the Cast, then on to the study of colour and finally to drawing the Figure.[269] If students required a knowledge of perspective, this would be taught after the figure class, and from the perspective class students would then proceed to the 'highest class in which he will study the history, principles and practice of Ornamental Design'.[270] Again, it does not seem as if there was any scope for practical work in this class, as the report goes on to state that 'By copying the best examples that can be obtained, he will be exercised in composition, that is, in forming new combinations and will be carefully taught to apply the knowledge he has acquired to various practical purposes'.[271] From the curriculum outlined above, which Heath Wilson proposed, it appears that students were to be taught to copy - and copy correctly - without any individual style or manner, before then going on to apply those skills to various materials and manufactures. There was a sense in which ornamental art was something to be applied to an object – rather in the manner of decoration – than something which could be considered part of the object in question. After Dyce's attempts at practical work with the weaving class had failed, it seems the curriculum of the schools of design remained drawing exercises, the feeling being that if a student could learn to draw (or copy) correctly, then those skills could be applied to any branch of manufactures in which he might be working. There was no sense that a knowledge of the material and whether or not a particular design could be applied to it in reality, might be necessary.

---

[265] *Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1843-4* (1844) HC 566, p 6.
[266] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[267] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[268] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[269] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[270] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[271] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

It was made clear that in the figure drawing room there should be examples of casts in which figures were 'combined with ornament' so that the 'practical application of all that is taught in these classes should be shown', and the room would therefore not resemble a figure room in an academy of fine art.[272] It seems that a study of the figure in three dimensions – as a cast – was acceptable so that students could see how their studies on paper might translate to an actual object. The examples of casts served the purpose of showing the students the sorts of ornament they might produce, but students were not given the chance to produce any objects themselves. Even though the curriculum of the schools was comprised of drawing exercises, the Council also made clear that 'no persons studying to become *artists*, as distinguished from *ornamentists,* will be admitted to the School of Design'.[273] There was a tension between teaching students figure drawing as a requisite of ornamental art, but at the same time not allowing the study of the figure to give students ideas about becoming fine artists; Heath Wilson's feeling was that the status of ornamental art should be raised and the distinction between high and ornamental art removed to show that a job in ornamental art was just as worthy as other branches of art, in the hope of dissuading students from desiring to become fine artists.[274] Unfortunately (to those on the Council of the School), the figure class had proved very popular and by 1845 was the most successful in the School, with work produced in that class being compared favourably with that of the Academy students: this was not what those at the RA had ever intended for the School of Design.[275] Even though there was a desire to dissuade students at the School of Design from becoming interested in fine art, it seems that the students themselves were keen on studying the higher branches of art.

Heath Wilson's course of instruction veered away from Dyce's attempts to align art with manufactures; he thought Dyce had been too concerned about 'trade', and not concerned enough with providing good examples of casts and antiques from which the students could copy. Heath Wilson was not particularly enthusiastic about technical instruction, preferring a more classical education instead; indeed, Frayling claims that

[272] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[273] *Ibid.*, p. 9-10.
[274] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[275] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

Heath Wilson was of the opinion that 'elementary drawing, followed by a sound knowledge of all things Roman, was by far the most effective training for a budding ornamentist'.[276] Whilst the feeling that students should not aspire to become fine artists was still held by those at the School, the introduction of figure drawing – even if supposedly strictly only for the purposes of ornamentation – had been one change made to the curriculum since the School started. In any early stage of a new venture, as in the case of the School of Design, changes and alterations were inevitable, though perhaps a clearer vision from the outset would have mitigated against some of the curriculum changes that took place in the early years of the school. Dyce had tried to introduce practical work to the school in the form of a weaving class, but this had proved unsuccessful. Under Heath Wilson the curriculum swung away from a more practical outlook and towards a classical education based on drawing correctly.

The *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-46* states that there were twelve classes comprising the course of instruction in the Head and Branch Schools:

Class 12 – Elementary Drawing (in outline, with pencil)
11 – Shading from the flat (from engraved examples, with chalk)
10 – Shading from casts (with chalk)
9 – Chiar-oscuro painting (grisaille)
8 – Colouring
7 – Figure drawing from the flat (from engraved examples)
6 – Figure drawing from the round (from casts)
5 – Painting the figure form the round (from casts and drapery)
4 – Geometrical drawing (applied to ornament)
3 – Perspective
2 – Modelling (from engraved examples, from casts and from nature)
1 – Design (comprising the various applications of art to ornamental productions and decoration)[277]

A modelling class had been introduced, which gave students a chance to work in clay or wax to produce work in three dimensions, though again, from the curriculum outlined above, this still appears to have been copying rather than producing any original designs

[276] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 23.
[277] *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6* (1846) HC 730, p. 3. Chiaroscuro is the study of elements of light and shade, while Grisaille is the technique of working only in monochrome, making use of shades of grey.

and students could only take this class once they had successfully passed through ten other classes at the School. The modelling class would though, have given students at least a chance a sense of the practicalities of creating something in three dimensions rather than on paper.

The School of Design had gone from having a focus on art for manufacturing under Dyce, to being oriented much more towards fine art under Heath Wilson, only seven years after it was founded with the express purpose of benefitting the manufacturing population of the country. The trouble was, no one knew quite how best to teach art in a way that would both educate the artisans *and* be useful to manufactures, and thus the outlook of the school swung hither and thither depending on the views of its Director. It also seems that the Council of the School did not see this as a particular problem and were happy for the curriculum to remain based on drawing exercises with a small amount of modelling. One of the objectives of the School of Design was to provide a knowledge of the arts and principles of design to the public, and this was being achieved, so perhaps there were no particular concerns among those on the Council about the lack of practical work for students.

One man who was concerned about the lack of practical work at the School was Richard Redgrave, who had been appointed as temporary figure master at the School of Design in 1846 and soon found that affairs there were not entirely satisfactory. He wrote to the Prime Minister on the matter, and the Council of the School was subsequently forced to appoint a Special Committee to investigate.[278] The first point of concern raised by Redgrave was that 'the principles of Ornament, and the practice of original design as applicable to manufactures, are not efficiently taught', and the second point of concern was that 'a knowledge of manufacturing processes, so as to enable the students to unite fitness and practicability in Ornament, is not communicated'.[279] Redgrave referred back to the Select Committee report of 1836 where it was stated that teaching at the school should be of direct practical application to manufactures and noted that this was not

[278] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 28.
[279] *Report of a Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design, appointed on the 3rd of November, 1846, To Consider and Report upon the State and Management of the School; with an Appendix* (1847) HC 835, p. 5.

being pursued, and something needed to be done to resolve the situation. The Special Committee recommended:

> '*a systematic and complete course of instruction* which should embrace *the theory and principles of ornamental design*, (including the history and explanation of the different styles,) *and the application of those principles to the various kinds of manufacture*, to the end that *the power of making original designs* may be acquired by the pupil, and may be *exercised by him, whilst in the School'*.[280]

For the third time in the nine years since the founding of the School, the curriculum was to be changed, this time to have a more practical outlook and attempt to return the School to the purpose of aiding manufactures. The Committee dissolved the existing Council of the School and a new Council was appointed.[281] Richard Redgrave, instigator of events, was appointed as Master of Flower-Drawing and Botany at the School and Heath Wilson was given a sideways post to look after the regional schools of design, and the running of the School was entrusted to three men; Townsend, in charge of the class of Form; Horsley, in charge of the class of Colour, and Dyce, who had been brought back, in charge of Ornament.[282] In the autumn of 1848 Dyce resigned from the School yet again and another Master of Ornament was appointed. So much change and re-shuffling of posts was not good for the School; with no continuity in those in charge it was hardly to be expected that classes would also have continuity to them. Every new director of the School had amended and restructured the curriculum and in 1848 the situation was no different. By 1848 Stafford Northcote had become President of the Board of Trade – the overseeing body of the Schools of Design – and to him it was clear that having three people running the school was not a good situation.[283] It was at this point that Henry Cole, a friend of Redgrave's, and a man who had been observing events unfolding at the School with a mixture of impatience and annoyance, was asked by Northcote to intervene.

---

[280] *Ibid.*, p. 7. Italics as per the text.
[281] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 28.
[282] *Ibid.*, p. 28 & Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 215.
[283] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 218.

3.6 The Select Committee of 1849

Cole was a civil servant working in the Record Commission, but was also a man who had taken a keen interest in the School of Design, probably because of his own personal interest in art and design. He had undertaken a short course in watercolour painting, and had also designed a tea-service, spending three days at Mintons advising the workmen on how to manufacture the pot, jug, cup and saucer.[284] Stafford Northcote wrote to Cole in 1848 asking him to suggest improvements for the School of Design: Cole in fact wrote three reports for Northcote; in the third he stated that 'I find my opinion of the unsatisfactory working of the school, so confirmed, that I am impelled to express my belief, that by no means short of a complete change of system, can the school fulfil its object, and its duty to the public'.[285] Cole apparently declared there was nothing more he could do for the Schools of Design, but then set about garnering public opinion regarding the Schools by way of a publication entitled the *Journal of Design and Manufactures* produced and edited by Cole himself.[286] The aim of the publication was, according to Bell, to annoy those at the School of Design, and pointed references were made to the shortcomings, as perceived by Cole, at the school:

> Where are the designers the schools were established to supply: who were to drive French and German patterns out of the British market?...Who will deny that, where the manufacture is native, the pattern is foreign?[287]

This was a direct reference to statements made in the 1835-6 Select Committee that manufacturers were purchasing designs and patterns from abroad because they were of superior quality than those produced in Britain, and was an issue which it was hoped would be remedied with the founding of the School of Design. The *Journal* was clearly making the point that the School of Design had apparently failed in its task of improving the patterns and designs of goods; Cole also wrote that the School had produced not designers, but only artists who 'normally cover dog kennels with

---

[284] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 30.
[285] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 219.
[286] *Ibid.*, p. 220.
[287] *Journal of Design* April 1849, p. 67, cited in Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 221-2.

crotchets…' as a result of being taught by 'dilettanti half-informed bunglers'.[288] He did not mince his words regarding the School of Design, and his opinions, via his *Journal of Design and Manufactures* and the three reports written for Stafford Northcote had an effect. The House of Commons set up a Select Committee in 1849 to 'inquire into the Constitution and Management of the Government School of Design, and to Report their Opinion thereupon to the House'.[289] While the Committee was primarily concerned with the School of Design in London, witnesses did refer to their experiences at the regional schools, and reports regarding these schools were included with the appendices in the final report. Witnesses to the Select Committee included members of the Committee of the School of Design, most of the teaching staff, manufacturers, and various others who had opinions to express, including Cole himself.[290] Northcote admitted the errors at the Normal School of Design, and blamed manufacturers for the shortcomings of the provincial schools; they were suspicious, stingy, short-sighted and downright obstructive.[291] There was an opinion that the schools of design – both in London and in the provinces – had become nothing more than mere drawing schools. JR Herbert, head master of the Class of Ornament at the School of Design was asked: 'The feeling among a good many is…that it has been too much of a drawing school, and not enough of a school for ornamental design; is that your view?' and replied 'It has been so, and that has been the great mistake'.[292] Northcote commented that the opinion of manufacturers was that 'These are mere drawing schools, and do not produce anything useful'.[293] When Cole was asked if 'the London and provincial schools are mere drawing schools at this time? he answered 'I should say, roughly speaking, that they are mere drawing schools…inasmuch as the masters do not understand design themselves, it seems to me impossible that they should be able to teach it'.[294]

---

[288] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p 32.
[289] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index* (1849) HC 576, p ii.
[290] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 32.
[291] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 225.
[292] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1849) HC 576, 1790.
[293] *Ibid.*, 114.
[294] *Ibid.*, 1962.

Witnesses were also asked what they thought the aim of the School of Design should be. Ambrose Poynter, an architect, stated that it was 'to give an artistic education to the class of designers and artisans who have hitherto had no opportunity of obtaining such an education as will make them good artists…the tendency of that instruction ought to be to lead them up to the art of design in general, and in particular cases to the particular manufactures to which they then intend to attach themselves'.[295]

John Bell, sculptor and latterly temporary head master of Form at the School of Design thought that the mission of the schools was 'to improve art workmanship…and to produce good designers', while Richard Burchett, a master at the School of Design took a similar view, opining that the object of the School should be 'not only the producing of designs, but the cultivation and development of taste of universally throughout the country, both among manufacturers and the public generally'.[296] These three witnesses considered that the School of Design was to give an artistic education, produce good designers, improve art workmanship, produce designs, and cultivate and develop taste among manufacturers and the public. Henry Cole, however, was of a slightly different opinion. He thought that 'the assumption in starting these schools was, that the benefit should be strictly commercial', and went on to state that: 'I do not think that these schools were created for aesthetic purposes, or for general educational purposes; but I think that the profession…almost in every report which touches upon the principle of the schools, has been the profession of applying the instruction specifically to manufactures, with a view to a commercial benefit'.[297]

Unsurprisingly, Cole did not think the schools had had any measurable commercial benefit upon manufacturing at all.[298] John Crace, a decorator employed in carrying out ornamental designs stated that he had 'never yet been able to find a pupil from the School of Design who was at all perfect in his art, able to assist me in his profession or to be of essential service in raising the character of taste in his manufactures'.[299] Crace shared his opinion with various other witnesses who all attested that students from the

[295] *Ibid.,* 472.
[296] *Ibid.,* 2555 & 3493.
[297] *Ibid.,* 3296.
[298] *Ibid.,* 3297.
[299] *Ibid.,* 2091.

School of Design had not had the impact upon art or manufactures that the School intended. Unsurprisingly, Stafford Northcote thought otherwise, stating that 'I believe that there are many very eminent designers who have been in our schools' and went on to cite examples from Nottingham and the Potteries.[300] There was, it appears, mixed opinion regarding the schools of design; those involved in the schools thought they had produced students who could produce designs and contribute to manufactures, but some manufacturers themselves contradicted this view.

Many witnesses to the Committee thought that the schools of design should be doing much more practical instruction for students, so that work would be more related to their intended employment. Burchett was asked 'Do you consider that what you call the application of artistic knowledge to the various processes of manufacture is carried out now as a matter of fact to the extent that you wish to see it carried?' and replied simply, 'No'.[301] John Harvey, a 'practical designer,' confirmed that it was his opinion that there was 'no one in the school who could give practical information upon the subject connected with design', and John Bell agreed that 'There must be a knowledge given to the student of the sort of design that is suited to the particular manufacture. He went on to note that 'the students themselves are very anxious for it, for they have been forming among themselves a mutual instruction class, one object of which is to club together their knowledge of the processes, because they do not know the process and they are very well aware of it'.[302] Ambrose Poynter stated that it was necessary that, in educating a designer, he should have actually made designs for practice, and stated that 'they would be imperfect designs if they were not capable of being executed'.[303] He also agreed that while it was impossible to teach students manufacturing processes to any great extent, they should at least be furnished with some knowledge of processes to enable them to make a design which a manufacturer would not reject.[304] There was, then, a realisation that if art were to be applied to manufacture, students at the schools of design would require some knowledge and experience of the practicalities of this in

[300] *Ibid.*, 325.
[301] *Ibid.*, 3552.
[302] *Ibid.*, 3747 & 2557-8.
[303] *Ibid.*, 483-5.
[304] *Ibid.*, 483-5.

order that they might see the relevance of what they were being taught at art school. Twelve years after the School of Design was founded, it seems that there was a growing realisation that merely undertaking drawing exercises on paper was not sufficient.

The other issue which was raised a number of times during the Committee was that of elementary education. Dyce, during his time as Head of the School of Design had recognised a fundamental problem: students were attending the School of Design supposedly to undertake advanced work in art but who had no prior drawing education. It took the government another ten years to recognise that the system of art education had effectively been established 'back to front'. As Dyce wrote:

> We have begun at the wrong end – we have established a university before have any grammar schools….and what has been the result? Why that the school instead of being an institution for the more advanced students of art, is filled with boys learning to draw.[305]

There was agreement that elementary work was important and should continue: Crace considered it to be 'most important', and John Bell thought all students should be grounded in elementary knowledge.[306] Similarly Herbert Minton, the china and earthenware manufacturer, agreed that elementary work was essential, and George Wallis, previously Principal Master of Manchester School of Design thought that to produce a good designer a student should be well grounded in the 'elementary art of drawing'.[307] Robert Harrison, a silk manufacturer from London, agreed that for those wishing to be designers they should receive a 'long and severe course of elementary teaching…'.[308] While elementary work was thought to be necessary for a pupil in order that they have a good grounding in drawing, Poynter made the astute point that one of the difficulties the schools had was that it was difficult to get students to complete the full course of instruction because 'as soon as pupils have acquired an elementary knowledge of the art they go away, for they are so superior to other artisans, whether lads or otherwise, who have not had the advantage of the schools, that they become immediately useful in manufactures; and that is a great bar to the efficiency of the

[305] Dyce, W Letter to Benjamin Hawes, *Dyce Papers,* VI cited in Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 90.
[306] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1849) HC 576, 2108 & 2608.
[307] *Ibid.,* 2759 & 3207.
[308] *Ibid.,* 3094.

schools, that very few stay to enter the upper classes'.[309] It seems that while the intention of the schools of design was for those wishing to undertake advanced work, few students actually achieved this level. The standard of drawing in the general population appears to have been so low that even attendance at the elementary classes at the schools resulted in students having an advantage over their fellow workers.

There was also some criticism of the 'one size fits all' curriculum which all schools had to follow. Thomas Battam, artist and director of a manufactory in Stoke commented that he disapproved of 'the general application of one code of rules to all the Schools of Design, irrespective of the requirements of the district in which they are placed', noting that in the Potteries there was only one staple trade, and 'that ought to have been made a primary object of consideration'.[310] Battam was asked if there were any designs that had been produced in the school that had been executed, and replied that this could not be the case as students did not have the opportunity of producing any designs as 'they are not tasked to it; they merely copy'.[311] Battam was pushed further on this and was asked if there was any 'exercise of original conception' and replied there was none, and that it was not allowed in the rules regulating the school.[312] He was then asked if he thought the production of original designs was a necessary part of such a school and replied 'I think it is the object of the foundation of the school, else why its name?'[313] Battam's comment is a pertinent one; the schools of design were not producing designs or designers, but those who could copy correctly on paper. The aim of the schools had been the application of art to manufactures and it seems that this had not been achieved.

A report on the Birmingham art school was included in the appendices of the 1849 Select Committee report, and Ambrose Poynter and Stafford Northcote noted that the school in Birmingham was 'embarrassed in its finances, and it does not at present afford to the students all the advantages it might'.[314] This they put down to the fact that

[309] *Ibid.*, 474.
[310] *Ibid.*, 2908.
[311] *Ibid.*, 2915.
[312] *Ibid.*, 2916.
[313] *Ibid.*, 2917.
[314] *Ibid.*, Appendix, No 2: *Reports of Mr Poynter and Mr Northcote on the Schools at Birmingham, the Potteries, Sheffield, York, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, Sheffield, Nottingham and Coventry,* p. 357.

Birmingham had a large number of small manufacturers, who were 'insensible to the value of artistic design' and who would therefore see no use in contributing to a school of design.[315] The Birmingham school was reported to be progressing well as far as drawing was concerned, but little of use to artisans was being provided in the study of colour, primarily because this class was taught during the day when artisans could not attend.[316] The biggest deficiency of the Birmingham school, though, was the modelling class, which had apparently never been well attended, and was taught part-time by the second master at the school.[317] As the report commented: 'it is impossible to expect the pupils to set any value on a course of instruction so little cared for with regard either to its quantity or quality, for it is doubtful whether the present teacher is at all competent to lead the pupils to the study of the figure, or indeed to the study of anything superior to what may be learned in the manufactories'.[318]

The overall picture presented by the Select Committee report was not an especially favourable one towards the schools of design: the schools had become mere drawing schools with not enough practical work being done; there had been very little measurable benefit on manufacturing; and having the same curriculum for all schools regardless of their local trades was not especially helpful. The teaching of ornamental art had 'presupposed the students having attained to a certain proficiency in elementary studies', which, as became clear very quickly, very few students had achieved.[319] The general feeling of the witnesses to the Select Committee was that maintaining the Schools of Design was 'an object of national importance', even though there were issues with some of the schools which required attention.[320] Cole made his views clear

---

[315] *Ibid.*, Appendix, No 2: *Reports of Mr Poynter and Mr Northcote on the Schools at Birmingham, the Potteries, Sheffield, York, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, Sheffield, Nottingham and Coventry,* p. 357.
[316] *Ibid.*, Appendix, No 2: *Reports of Mr Poynter and Mr Northcote on the Schools at Birmingham, the Potteries, Sheffield, York, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, Sheffield, Nottingham and Coventry,* p. 358.
[317] *Ibid.*, Appendix, No 2: *Reports of Mr Poynter and Mr Northcote on the Schools at Birmingham, the Potteries, Sheffield, York, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, Sheffield, Nottingham and Coventry,* p. 358.
[318] *Ibid.*, Appendix, No 2: *Reports of Mr Poynter and Mr Northcote on the Schools at Birmingham, the Potteries, Sheffield, York, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, Sheffield, Nottingham and Coventry,* p. 358.
[319] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index* (1849) HC 576, p iv
[320] *Ibid.*, p. iii.

that schools should be run 'as any merchant would work a business, not made a talking thing but a doing thing, it would in less than three years surprise all persons who at present have their own way in designs'.[321] The view of the Committee was that 'the schools are educational institutions, and their main object is to produce not so much designs as designers, and persons better qualified to apply and execute design in all its various branches'.[322] This was not a task which could be achieved quickly though, and the Committee recognised that it could not be carried out properly unless a student was also already engaged in or connected with the trade, where he could learn by experience.[323] The Committee summed up the situation regarding the schools thus:

> Admitting that a certain amount of good has been accomplished by the schools, Your Committee are of opinion that it has been almost exclusively in the general artistic education; the remote effect of which is undoubtedly to qualify artisans to become better workers out of ornamental designs. But Your Committee agree with Mr Herbert, that the schools have not hitherto produced any decided impression on decorative manufactures, either in the execution of them or in the creation of original designs for them: they think the admission of Mr Poynter…coupled with the allegation of Mr Cole…and the Evidence instanced, prove that the Schools of Design have hitherto fallen short of carrying out their original purpose.[324]

After the Select Committee the School carried on as before, but with a new committee overseeing it, and Cole became too involved in organising the Great Exhibition of 1851 to give much energy to matters at the School.[325] However once the Great Exhibition was over, Cole then took up his cause again and wrote to Labouchere, President of the Board of Trade, suggesting that a special department within the Board of Trade be formed, called the Department of Practical Art, and which would direct elementary drawing and modelling, the practice of art concerned with processes, and 'the cultivation of the power of drawing'.[326] Labouchere apparently thought this was a good

---

[321] *Ibid.*, 2051.
[322] *Ibid.*, p. iv.
[323] *Ibid.*, p. iv.
[324] *Ibid.*, p. xv.
[325] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p 34.
[326] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index*, (1849) HC 576 p. v. & C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 35.

idea, and unsurprisingly Cole was named as the General Superintendent of the new Department of Practical Art, with Richard Redgrave the Superintendent for Art.[327]

3.7 Cole starts reorganising

While the aim of the schools of design may have been clear in the minds of those on the Select Committees of 1835-6 and 1849, what was not clear was the best means of achieving those aims. Cole had his own ideas on the matter, but was to find that his method was not as workable in practice as it seemed in theory, and he subsequently turned his attention to another aspect of art education - elementary instruction and teacher training - setting art education on a course from which it was very hard to deviate and which would have implications for policy-makers on design education into the twentieth century.

Cole's first task, in 1852, was to start reorganising the schools of design straight away, setting up what Frayling called 'a paternalistic and extremely bureaucratic regime'.[328] Prior to 1852, events at the School of Design in London were such that, as Bell notes, 'it can hardly be said that any system had been tried and proved or tried and found wanting, for the authorities were practically incapable of putting any theory into practice'.[329] The first Head of the School, Papworth, had only been in position for one year; following him, Dyce had attempted to introduce practical work at the school and had failed, and then under Heath Wilson the emphasis at the School had been more on fine art. No one method was tried long enough to see any tangible results. Cole was determined to change this and wanted to see the original aim of practical art associated with manufactures achieved.

Gottfried Semper, the German architect and a political refugee in London at the time, was appointed the Professor of a class dealing with 'the principles and practice of

[327] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 35.
[328] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[329] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 255.

Ornamental Art applied to Metal Manufactures'.[330] Semper started at the School in 1852, and three months later submitted a document to Cole suggesting ways in which teaching at the School might be reformed. Apparently, it was only Semper's own class, and another in woven fabrics taught by a Mr Hudson which were following the guideline of 'constant reference to industrial production'.[331] Semper's recommendation was to base all teaching on practice in the workshop, using students as assistants to a Professor's own commissioned work, and to reduce the amount of time students spent copying from models.[332] When Semper left the School in 1855, his three main classes were attended by 13 day students, 22 evening students and 50 teacher training students, and the involvement of the students in 'real life' commissions had proved popular.[333] Frayling writes that Cole had encouraged industrialists and manufacturers to consult the Professors who taught technical classes in regards to students executing designs at the School, but this was only happening in the metal work and fabric classes.[334] Cole himself consulted various manufacturers as to what was going wrong. One thought that the public demand for low priced goods meant that they would not be prepared to pay slightly higher prices even if goods were of better design; another felt that their workmen would not attend classes at the School as they would be too tired after a 12 or 16 hour day at work.[335] Even among students, there was reportedly not a great desire for practical training. One, who had been given a scholarship for training in silk weaving and design, had abandoned it and gone to take up portrait painting.[336] It seems that even though efforts were made to try and encourage manufacturers to take an interest in the schools of design, this was only happening piecemeal, and students themselves were still tending towards the study of fine art.

As Bell writes, Cole must have found it disconcerting to realise that manufacturers were perhaps not as interested in the schools of design as he felt they should be.[337] For a man

[330] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p 39.
[331] *Ibid.*, p. 39-40.
[332] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[333] *Ibid.*, p. 40
[334] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[335] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[336] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[337] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 257.

so apparently passionate about art education as Cole appeared, to find that there were people who did not share his opinions on the importance of design and the schools of design, must have been disheartening. Cole concluded that it would be at least two years before manufacturers started taking more of an interest in the decorative arts, and as a result, turned his attention to another matter: that of elementary art education. There had been agreement during the 1849 Select Committee that elementary education in art was important, and Cole himself agreed with this opinion, stating that he did not underestimate the importance of elementary art education and that 'I should wish to see it carried ten times beyond what it now is, and even to the extent of making the learning of drawing a part of the instruction in national schools'.[338] In the event, this is exactly what Cole did.

3.8 The National Course of Instruction

Cole, like Dyce before him, realised that attendance at the School of Design presupposed a level of elementary education in art, but it was obvious that students were attending the School with little or no previous art instruction, and therefore instead of being able to undertake advanced work in the way originally intended, students instead required elementary classes to bring them 'up to speed' so to speak. Cole and Redgrave together set out proposals for a system by which elementary art classes could be established in towns and cities all around the country. The intention was also to link in with classes at Mechanics' Institutes where possible, as these institutions often held drawing classes of their own.[339] Classes would have to be funded by the towns and cities themselves, but the Department of Practical Art would assist with guaranteeing a teacher's salary, and providing books and materials at half price.[340] Alongside this plan was a system of art education, drawn up by Redgrave, which could be adapted for each school and for each different requirement. There had been some concern during the 1849 Select Committee that a 'one size fits all' curriculum for the art schools was not a

[338] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index* (1849) HC 576, 1976.
[339] *Ibid.*, p. vi.
[340] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 40.

helpful thing; for one thing it did not take into account trades local to a particular school, and did not allow for any adaption of the curriculum to make instruction more relevant to those trades. Cole and Redgrave, however, seem not to have been concerned by this, and Redgrave's 23-stage National Course of Instruction became the curriculum which all schools of design had to follow.[341] Beginning with stage one - linear drawing by aid of instruments - and ending with stage 23, technical studies, there was some scope for sections to be missed out, depending on the classes the student wished to take, though within each stage the same things were taught in all schools of design. Designers and ornamentalists, for example, had to undertake the full course, leaving out only section 19 and section 'a' of stages 2, 3, 4 and 23; machinists and engineers, on the other hand, only had to do stages 1-5 and then 23.[342] The art curriculum was thus standardised; everyone doing stage 3 in every school of design across the country would be copying casts from either the lower portion of the pilaster of the gates of la Madeleine church in Paris, or the lower portion of two pilasters from the tomb of Louis XII in Paris.[343] As Frayling notes, everyone was taught the same thing, in the same way, and the eventual intention was that students taught using Redgrave's curriculum would then go and be art teachers themselves, teaching the same course in the same way as they themselves had been taught.[344] It seems Redgrave was more concerned not with the 'how' of applying a design to manufacture, but 'what' to design, and the 'what' was to be based on classical forms copied accurately. It was more important for students to learn what to design, rather than how to apply it to manufacture, and this was how Redgrave set up his curriculum.

By the end of 1852, 350 towns had applied to the Department of Practical Art for help in setting up elementary art classes, and by the end of 1855, there were forty-four regional art schools around the country, all of which led to a rising demand for art

[341] See appendix 4 for the full course of instruction.
[342] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 41.
[343] A pilaster is an architectural element found in classical architecture which gives the appearance of a supporting column but generally only used for ornament.
[344] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 41.

teachers.[345] The School in London attempted to meet this demand, which resulted in the School becoming almost entirely a teacher training institution; it was described in 1859 as having 'its primary purpose the supply of art teachers to all places which seek to establish art schools'.[346] There was another Select Committee on the Schools of Design in 1864 and during this Cole was able to state that there were 90 art schools in existence around the country, teaching 16,000 students, while art teachers in schools for the poor were educating around 70,000 pupils.[347] Twelve years after Cole and Redgrave had set about their mission of providing art education on a mass scale, a system of art education in art and national schools was up and running, and this, in itself, was a significant achievement. Far more people were given the opportunity to learn to draw than had previously been the case, when private drawing schools and the Royal Academy had been the preserve of those who could afford the fees or had the time to attend. Now, for the first time, art education was being provided on a mass scale. Cole had achieved his aim of educating the masses in art, though it had led to the School of Design becoming a place for training art teachers, rather than a place for training designers to benefit manufactures. Whilst he had achieved one of the aims of the 1835-6 Select Committee, that of providing a knowledge of art to the population, the recommendations in both the 1835-6 and 1849 Select Committees that the schools of design be relevant to manufacture and have some practical basis to them, seems to have been put to one side as the National Course of Instruction was set up and implemented.

There were critics of Cole and Redgrave's system. John Ruskin, writing in the late 1800s about Cole, commented that he had 'corrupted the system of art teaching all over England into a state of abortion and falsehood from which it will take twenty years to recover'.[348] In the event, it took longer than Ruskin's perceived twenty years for the schools to recover. Strand, writing with the benefit of hindsight in 1987 states that Cole created, in effect:

---

[345] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 40.
[346] R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (Council for National Academic Awards, 1987) p. 3.
[347] Q. Bell *The Schools of Design* (London, 1963) p. 256.
[348] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 41.

> an organisation for the control of teaching in art and design which was to last, with minor changes, for over half a century. It was in fact to take more than a hundred years to liberate the art schools from the shackles of a centrally determined syllabus and examination system.[349]

3.9 The Department of Science and Art takes control

In 1853 the Department of Practical Art had been renamed the Science and Art Department, and had control over the curriculum of the schools of design, examinations, the appointment of drawing masters, and the awarding of scholarships and prizes.[350] The Department had also, by 1857, become the responsibility of the Privy Council on Education, rather than the Board of Trade, possibly also a reflection of the change of emphasis at the School in London which by this time had become almost entirely devoted to teacher training.[351] This was also reflected in the renaming of the School in 1864 to the National Art Training School (also National School) when it moved to new accommodation specifically built for it.[352] The use of the word art in the name of the School may also reflect the change of emphasis away from art as applied to manufactures or the production of designs, towards art as meant by drawing exercises on paper with no practical work. In 1864 there was another Select Committee to review the situation at the National Art Training School; this Committee thought that 'The period from 1837 to 1852 may be regarded as a period of experiment…The questions which arose in the course of this experiment were numerous, and did not admit of immediate solution'[353] These questions which arose included whether teaching should be elementary instruction or more advanced work for designers, and also whether the teaching should be for the general instruction of the public or the particular education of ornamental artists.[354]

---

[349] R. Strand *Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (Council for National Academic Awards, 1987) p. 3.
[350] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[351] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 46.
[352] *Ibid.*, p. 48.
[353] *Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1864) HC 466, p iii.
[354] *Ibid.*, p. iii.

The Committee report also noted the work of Cole and Redgrave in setting up 'a highly organised and complete system of instruction in all branches of Art connected with, or bearing on, Manufactures', and commented that the pair had 'greatly improved the central school in London, in which they undertook the training of masters for the benefit of the provincial schools'.[355] The Select Committee did question however, whether Cole and Redgrave's curriculum was perhaps *too* systematised and wondered 'if it may be worth considering whether an equal disadvantage might not result from having too much system'; they went on to note that 'The very carefully constructed system of instruction which has been put forth by the Department of Science and Art cannot fail to be of high value to the Art Education of this country; but it appears to Your Committee to be very questionable whether it would be desirable to force that system, in all its details, upon every school in the United Kingdom'.[356] Witnesses to the 1849 Select Committee had raised concerns regarding the suitability of a national curriculum for all art schools, but it appears that Cole and Redgrave maintained that their system could be adapted as necessary by local art schools, though this appears not to have happened in practice. By following the National Course of Instruction set out by Redgrave, there was still no scope for the application of art to manufactures and many manufacturers complained that not enough was done to teach art in relation to industry, though they did agree that the art schools were of advantage to their workmen and designers.[357] Although manufacturers were generally positive about the schools, the Committee noted that 'their appreciation of them is not yet likely to carry them so far as to the point of supporting them by their subscriptions'; as the Committee went on to state, in manufacturing towns such as Manchester the elementary art education offered was not of enough value to manufacturers to merit them supporting the art schools.[358]

[355] *Ibid.*, p. iii.
[356] *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
[357] *Ibid.*, p. x.
[358] *Ibid.*, p. x-xi.

3.10 The foundation of Leicester School of Art

Leicester School of Art is the third case study in this thesis and its history deserves telling, particularly as, almost from its start, the School attempted to make its training relevant to the local students with the introduction of craft classes, even though this was not approved of by the Department of Science and Art. Leicester's School of Art was founded in 1869, relatively late in comparison to other regional art schools and after more than thirty years of interest in setting up such a school amongst those in the town.[359] Information on the early history of the School is scant, comprised primarily of Lys de Beaumont's thesis *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939*.[360] She argues that the reason a town with a strong manufacturing base, as Leicester had in boot and shoe manufacture and in hosiery, did not found an art school until well after other towns and cities had done so was due to disinterest on the part of local manufactures and 'a prevalence of religious and political sectarianism' which prevented a school being founded.[361] There was reportedly distrust on the part of the manufacturers in the town; Leicester, like Birmingham, had many small workshops and a school of design was seen by some as a threat to trade secrecy; it might give artisans from different companies a change to pool knowledge, to the detriment of the various manufacturers.[362]

Prior to the foundation of the art school Leicester had a number of educational and philanthropic societies in existence which gave lectures on a wide variety of subjects, some of which would appeal to those involved in local trades.[363] There were also lectures given on the history of fine art, while a few were, according to de Beaumont, 'concerned with the so-called "applied" arts such as glass work'.[364] The Mechanics'

---

[359] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (Leicester Polytechnic: unpublished MPhil, 1987) p, 11.
[360] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987)
[361] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[362] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[363] *Ibid.*, p. 20. A Mechanics' Institute had been founded in 1833; a Literary and Philosophical Society in 1836; an Athenaeum Society in 1847; Leicestershire Archaeological Society in 1855, and a Working Men's College in 1862. L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (Leicester Polytechnic: unpublished MPhil, 1987) p. 20.
[364] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Institutes in Leicester also held 'popular' exhibitions in 1840: de Beaumont comments that these were 'seen largely as a means of educating the local population in 'taste' and furthering an interest in cultural pursuits and the arts', something which those on the Select Committee had desired.[365] As well as specimens of natural history and mechanical inventions, de Beaumont writes that works of art and 'probably also local manufactured goods' were on display to the public, and lectures and demonstrations also accompanied the exhibitions.[366] The Mechanics' Institute had also started a drawing class in 1836, and a collection of drawings, engravings and antique casts had been donated by various benefactors over the years, but de Beaumont writes that the attendance at the drawing class was never in large numbers.[367]

Leicester Museum opened in 1849, and it was hoped that this would be the catalyst for a school of design to also be established in the same premises, however it was to be another twenty years before Leicester got its school of design.[368] Ambrose Poynter's evidence to the Select Committee of 1849 indicates that he was aware that an application had been made from Leicester for the establishment of an school of design in the town, and that Mr Hammersley had been asked to visit Leicester and report on the situation there.[369] Hammersely, Principal of Manchester School of Art, had visited Leicester in 1847 and given a lecture regarding the need for a school of design in the town, though whether this was in response to the application for an art school is not clear. According to de Beaumont, after Hammersley's visit in 1847, a committee was formed in Leicester with the aim of starting a school of design, and a private donation secured.[370] However, nothing further appears to have happened until 1853 when the Mechanics' Institute in Leicester set up a school of design or Elementary School of Art,

---

[365] *Ibid.*, p. 21. The Mechanics' Institute had been founded in Leicester 1833, with the intention of promoting 'the diffusion of general and useful knowledge….and the cheap instruction of the members in the principles of the Arts they practice'. See Mechanics' Institute 'Rules of Leicester Mechanics' Institute for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge Among the Working-Classes, 1833, p. 3 Cited in de Beaumont p. 23.

[366] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 21.

[367] *Ibid.,*. p. 20.

[368] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[369] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design: together with the proceedings of the committee, minutes of evidence, appendix and index* (1849) HC 576, 591-2.

[370] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 28.

based ‘upon the system at present approved in the Metropolis’, which seems to have been similar to other branch schools of design.[371] The school started with thirty students and the intention from the outset was for the school to be self-supporting, as the Mechanics’ Institute had no surplus money to fund the venture long-term.[372] The Institute itself was facing difficulties; numbers attending classes was dropping as other local societies offered more popular lectures to the public. Although the art classes at the Institute had proved to be very popular, there were no sponsors willing to continue to fund the school of design, and by 1859 all art classes had ceased.[373]

De Beaumont argues that the failure of the Mechanics’ Institute to support a school of design in Leicester can be attributed to religious and political sectarianism, and a lack of support from the local trade unions.[374] She comments that this sectarianism was peculiar to Leicester and was a hindrance to the development of education in the town.[375] The Mechanics Institute had been founded in 1833, when an Anglican and Tory-dominated town council was in place, and had been the subject of criticism for being a ‘liberal-dissenting institution set up for subversive action…’.[376] The management of the Institute denied there was any political purpose to their venture, but prejudice remained, even when a more liberal council was appointed in 1836. According to de Beaumont, following the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act, council posts in Leicester were no longer dominated by Anglicans and Tories; instead the council was comprised primarily of Liberal dissenting Protestants who were to dominate the running of Leicester until the end of the nineteenth century.[377] As de Beaumont notes, although religious or political sectarianism may have caused some to be suspicious of the aims of the Mechanics’ Institute, there is no evidence to suggest that any of the lectures on art which were held there reflected any religious or political divisions, so it is not immediately clear why the school failed to thrive.[378] The may well have been suspicion

[371] *Ibid.*, p. 29.
[372] *Ibid.*, p. 29.
[373] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[374] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[375] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[376] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[377] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[378] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

about being associated with the 'other', regardless of whether lectures had any religious or political overtones to them. Attendance at an institute felt to be influenced by Liberals was not going to be attended in great numbers by Tories, for example. For further explanation, de Beaumont looks to the nature of the trades in Leicester at the time. Hosiery was the dominant trade in Leicester during the early to mid-1800s and concentrated primarily on plain goods, therefore pattern designers were felt to be unnecessary.[379] Most of the goods produced were sold locally, so as de Beaumont comments, arguments that art education was necessary to improve exports abroad were also largely irrelevant.[380] In the 1840s however, 'fancy work' started to become popular once again, and in 1845 Nottingham hosier William Felkin described Leicester hosiery as having 'Novelty in design and beauty in execution…'.[381] The lack of an art school in the town had been noted in London; Henry Cole commenting during the 1864 Select Committee that 'Leicester has been maundering over having an Art School for 15 years past, and it has not got one yet…'.[382] There seems to have been no urgency to start an art school in Leicester, though the issue was on the minds of those in the town as, in January 1869 at the Town Hall, the question of an art school for Leicester was again raised.[383] De Beaumont writes that this time, demand for a school of art came from an influential body of fairly well-to-do individuals who would have no direct benefit from the school, but who were interested in educational reform and cultural pursuits and keen to ensure that Leicester didn't lag behind other towns in the area in its cultural activities.[384] Unlike London and Birmingham, where there was an apparent desire on the behalf of the artisans in those cities for some art education, de Beaumont's thesis does not suggest that the workers in Leicester had a similar desire to be educated in art. That the final push for a school of art came from the moneyed section of local society and those with an interest in educational reform and the status of the town suggests an

[379] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[380] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[381] W. Felkin *History of the Machine-Wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures* 1867 (Newton Abbott: 1967) p. 472. Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 33
[382] *Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1864) HC 466, p 33.
[383] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p 37.
[384] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

element of ‘keeping up with the Joneses’ about the founding of Leicester’s art school; if other towns in the area had one, so should Leicester.

The meeting held in January 1869 proposed that a Committee be formed to investigate the possibility of a school of art for the town, and included on this Committee were four individuals directly involved in manufacturing: two hosiers, a wool stapler and a boot and shoe manufacturer.[385] Nine months later, in September 1869, the organising secretary of the Department of Science and Art – which was by then the government department overseeing the schools of design - one JC Buckmaster, visited Leicester and lectured on the advantages of schools of art; following this visit it was decided that an art school should be set up in Leicester.[386] Twelve patrons for the school came forward, most of whom were already known as patrons and collectors of the arts; the Duke of Rutland Lord John Manners, MP; Earle Howe, MP; Thomas Paget, High Sheriff of Leicestershire, among others.[387] The school was eventually established under the pretext of aiding local manufacturing, even though, according to de Beaumont, there was little connection with or support from local manufacturers.[388] Given that the school in Birmingham, if it wanted some Government funding to aid the school, was required to be of use to manufactures and not concentrate on fine art, it may well have been that Leicester’s art school was also reported to be for the benefit of local manufactures in order to secure similar funding from London.

The first principal of the Leicester School of Art was Wilmot Pilsbury; he was a product of the art school system, having trained at Birmingham’s art school between 1853-9, and then gone to the National School in London where he had gained his art teacher’s certificate.[389] This was Cole and Redgrave’s system in action; a student could be trained locally following the 22 stage curriculum set out by Redgrave, go to London to gain an art teacher’s certificate, and then go on to become an art teacher in another local school, teaching the same curriculum to the same standard by which he had himself been

[385] *Ibid.*, pp. 37-8.
[386] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[387] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[388] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[389] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

trained. Pilsbury was approved by the National School to teach five out of the seven available subjects: elementary drawing and colouring, painting from ornament and nature (with elementary design), the figure drawn and painted (with anatomical studies), mechanical drawing, and architectural drawing.[390] Leicester's art school, like the other branch schools, followed the National Course of Instruction set out by Cole and Redgrave; classes at Leicester were separated into day and evening sessions and catered for different groups of students with 'ladies and gentlemen' (non artisans) attending classes during the day, while workers would attend classes in the evenings, as happened in London and Birmingham.[391]

By 1870 Leicester's curriculum consisted of:

> Freehand drawing (from ornamental and figure copies, models and objects)
> Mechanical drawing (the projection of shadows, drawing of screws and wheels, development of surfaces of solids and drawing machinery from life and with measuring instruments)
> Geometry (both practical and descriptive)
> Perspective
> Architectural drawing (including building construction)
> Ornamental drawing (including the study of historical styles and historical design, shading from flat copies and antique casts)
> Anatomy
> Painting (in oil and water colours from antique casts and still life)
> Landscape drawing (in oil and water colour from copies and life).[392]

Again, as was the case in London and Birmingham, the curriculum was focussed around drawing and was primarily technical drawing exercises with more painterly subjects for the advanced student. If Leicester's art school was following the curriculum set out by Cole and Redgrave, there was no opportunity for any practical work to be done.[393] This may well not have been a concern among the students at Leicester; according to de Beaumont the majority of students were not artisans and wanted to do landscape work, which Pilsbury, as a landscape painter, was apparently happy to teach.[394] Of the students at the school who were considered artisans, 11% were listed as carpenters and

[390] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[391] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[392] *Ibid.*, p. 57-8.
[393] *Ibid.*, p. 58.
[394] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

joiners, 10% as draftsmen, 10% were clerks and 8% practical engineers, and these students may have found benefit in the opportunity for some practical work.[395] Although a painter, Pilsbury seems to have thought that instruction more relevant to local trades would be useful and in 1872 reportedly contacted employers in Leicester's principle trades to suggest changes to the school's curriculum so as to benefit the artisan students.[396] Whether any changes to Leicester's curriculum were made after his enquiries is not clear, but Pilsbury was at least aware that training relevant to local trades would be useful.

Cole and Redgrave's system was by now up and running in all art schools in the country. All students followed the National Course of Instruction, with many of them going on to become art teachers themselves, teaching students the same course in the same way that they themselves had been taught. Practical work had been largely forgotten in spite of the comments during the 1849 Select Committee that the practical application of what was taught at art school would be beneficial to students.

3.11 The end of the Cole and Redgrave era

In 1873 Cole retired from the Department of Science and Art, followed in 1875 by Redgrave, who summed up his and Cole's work as:

> the conversion of twenty limp Schools of Design into 120 flourishing Schools of Art in all parts of the United Kingdom, and other schools like them, in the Colonies and the United States. Five hundred night classes for drawing have been established by artisans. One hundred and eighty thousand boys and girls are now learning elementary drawing.[397]

It can, of course be argued that Redgrave was always going to consider his efforts to have been successful, and the expansion of art education, taken in itself, was a significant achievement. It had, however, done nothing to further benefit manufactures in the country. Perhaps the biggest indication of this was the change of name noted in

[395] *Ibid.*, p. 52-3.
[396] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[397] Cited in C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 52.

the quotation above, from Schools of Design to Schools of Art, reflecting the move away from educating artisans in the principles of design and towards the mass education of the public in art. The National School in London had essentially become a teacher training institution, and all design schools and all design students across the country now followed a standardised curriculum based on copying classical forms.
Following Redgrave's departure, Edward Poynter was appointed both Principal of the National Art Training School and Director of Art in 1875. Poynter's interest was life drawing; he had experience of the methods employed at the *Ecole des Beaux Arts* in Paris and had subsequently put some of his observations into practice at as Professor of Fine Art at the Slade School, and now intended to do the same at the National School.[398] There was a renewed emphasis on fine art training; more and more fee-paying students attending the School desired to become artists, and many had been accepted at the Royal Academy Schools.[399] Poynter seemingly, continued the emphasis on art and drawing that Cole and Redgrave had started, and during his brief time at the School did nothing to attempt any practical instruction.

After numbers at the School dropped through the 1880s, an internal committee decided that the teaching and accommodation at the School, both of which had been cause for criticism, should be reorganised.[400] One of the harshest critics of the School was the Secretary of the Department of Science and Art, one General Donnelly. He reportedly started that if the School was in decline, 'it must be because it is not wanted, or because it is not doing its job properly. If it is not wanted, it had better be shut up, and if it is inefficient, then I think you can only deal with that school as you would with any other public school; improve it by modifying its staff'.[401] Donnelly's criticism of the School was perhaps rather harsh – if he had considered it was not doing its job properly in terms of training artists for the benefit of manufactures, then the School merited all the criticism thrown at it; if, however Donnelly's criticism was that it was not doing the job of training teachers, that would seem rather unjust, as that is exactly what the School

[398] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London 1987) p. 52.
[399] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[400] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[401] *Ibid.*, p.57.

was doing. The first suggestion of Donnelly's – that the School be shut up – was completely unacceptable, but the committee did acknowledge that teaching had to be reorganised and accommodation improved. It wasn't until 1894 that Donnelly set out his ideas for the School and teaching was reformed and in 1896 the School was renamed as the Royal College of Art (RCA) and was able to grant its own diplomas.[402] According to the Calendar, its purpose was 'the training of art teachers of both sexes, of designers, and of Art workmen…'.[403]

In the sixty three years since its foundation, the RCA had gone from being called the School of Design, to the National Art Training School, to the Royal College of Art, and the dropping of the word design from the title of the School reflects the change in orientation from the production of designs and designers for the benefit of manufactures, to the training of art teachers and of art workmen. Select Committees and Councils of the School had failed to address the question of how to best educate designers, and had then failed to stop Cole and Redgrave from turning the entire system of art education to one based on training art teachers and educating the public via a systematised, rigid curriculum based on copying. Practical work had been attempted at the School in London, first by Dyce and then by Cole, but this had proved unpopular and had been stopped, and training had remained as drawing exercises. Comments from witnesses to the 1849 Select Committee seemed to indicate that there was a desire for training to be more relevant to manufactures, and that practical work should form part of this, but, as suggested in the introduction to the chapter, it was the question of *how* this should happen that wasn't able to be answered satisfactorily.

3.12 The beginnings of reform

In 1898 the artist and book illustrator Walter Crane became Principal of the RCA and set about a reform of the College, attempting again to introduce practical work to the College. He asked for extra workshop facilities, more practical classes to give students

[402] *Ibid.*, p. 58.
[403] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

an insight into the relationship between design and materials, and an exhibition space where students could create complete interiors.[404] In 1899 some of these recommendations were put into practice. The College was reorganised into four schools: Mural and Decorative Painting, Sculpture and Modelling, Architecture, and Design, each with its own Professor.[405] Following Crane's short period of time at the RCA, Augustus Spencer, who had previously been head of Leicester School of Art, became principal in 1900, a post he held for twenty years. The teaching emphasis was still strong, though now not the *only* purpose of the College, and, as Frayling comments, as the RCA was no longer solely training art teachers, its role had become ambiguous.[406] Spencer continued to introduce practical classes and by 1905 the College was able to offer facilities for practical classes in woodcarving and gesso, stained glass, calligraphy and illumination, tapestry and weaving, and pottery. Other classes for furniture, enamelling, stone and marble carving, textile weaving printing, and mosaic work all required more expensive resources and were awaiting on funding from the Board of Education before they could be started.[407] Started by Walter Crane, and continued by Spencer, the RCA was at last returning to practical work for students.

By 1910 the College no longer took part in the national competitions which were part of the course of instruction set out by Cole and Redgrave, and questions had begun to be asked regarding the RCA's place within a system of national art education.[408] The College was seen as both a training college to supply teachers for regional art schools and a place where the pick of the students from the local schools could be trained in more advanced work for industry.[409] It was therefore sending art teachers out, and receiving students in. The question was which of these two issues – teacher training or training for industry - should predominate and how the two issues related to each other.[410] The Board of Education set up a Departmental Committee to investigate these issues and published its final report in 1911; some of the statistics in the appendix made

[404] *Ibid.*, p. 66-7.
[405] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[406] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[407] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[408] *Ibid.*, p. 77-9.
[409] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[410] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

for interesting reading. According to the report, only 25% of students stayed at the College long enough to complete their courses and apparently, only 26 students out of all of those who graduated between 1901 and 1910 had gone on to become professional designers or craftspeople.[411] In view of the strong emphasis on art teacher training and the lack of practical work at the College in the preceding years, this last statistic is perhaps unsurprising. Given that the original aim of the School of Design back in 1837 was to be of benefit to manufactures, it can be argued that the School had failed, and failed miserably in this regard.

Conflicting views were brought before the 1910 Committee, perhaps reflecting the on-going discussions about the RCA since it had started. Manufacturers thought that RCA students had too little knowledge of the history of design and the styles that the public liked; teachers at the College thought that courses were too historical and did not let students develop their own personal style.[412] Frayling writes that the solution was to encourage students to take more of an 'apprentice' role in classes to replicate professional conditions, perhaps in a similar manner to the classes held by Gottfried Semper in the 1850s. It seems ironic that sixty years later, in 1910, the same solution was being proposed, and gives rise to questions as to the direction art education would have taken had it not been diverted off course away from manufactures by Cole and Redgrave.

The intention was to reduce the amount of art teacher training at the College though it was to be another thirty years or so before the RCA fully shed its teacher training responsibilities.[413] There was also the intention to make the RCA 'a place of research, providing opportunity for the highest specialisation in art and craft, and conducted to meet the fullest educational requirements of both the artist and craftsman', though again, it would be the late 1940s before it came to full fruition.[414] This was the first time that mention had been made of the RCA becoming what was in essence a postgraduate institution and Frayling writes regarding the College, that by 1911 there was 'no point

[411] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[412] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[413] *Ibid.*, pp. 81 & 83.
[414] Cited in *Ibid.*, pp. 81-83.

in pretending that its primary function, in the early part of the twentieth century, was to provide artisans with an understanding of the principles of design, for that was no longer the case…. 'the provinces' could deal quite adequately with that side of things'.[415]

Local art schools then, were to take on the responsibility for training art teachers, though some would go to the RCA for more advanced work, and the local schools were also to undertake the training of artisans in the principles of design. The two local art schools which are examined in this thesis were indeed both providing teacher training and art education for their students, but towards the end of the 1800s both schools attempted to offer more practical, relevant training to their students; a move which was not approved of by the Department of Science and Art.

3.13 Changes at Birmingham and Leicester

By 1880 art education in Birmingham had grown significantly; there was one Central School of Art in the city and six branch schools of art, with around 1320 students attending; by 1900 the Central School had moved into new, purpose-built accommodation, and had fifteen branch schools, with around 4268 students attending the schools, over 1300 of whom attended the Central School.[416] The Birmingham school had also gone from being supported by the Government's Department of Science and Art, to, in 1885, being the first municipal art school, under the control of the city. The Department of Science and Art still oversaw examinations but with the ratepayers of Birmingham having more of an influence in the school, it became increasingly independent from London.[417] As a result of this the art schools in Birmingham developed links with local industries, and at times challenged the Department of

[415] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design* (London, 1987) p. 83.
[416] J. Swift 'Birmingham Art Schools: Its Branch Schools and Female Students 1880-1900' in B. Tilson (Ed) *Made in Birmingham: Design and Industry 1889-1989* (Studley, 1989) p. 49. The Central School was for advanced art teaching, the Branch Schools for elementary teaching, thus the Branch Schools fed into the Central School.
[417] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

Science and Art over what was appropriate art and design education for their students.[418]

While the emphasis at the National Art Training School in London was shifting away from industrial design and towards fine art under the direction of Poynter, in the 1880s at Leicester's school of art the opposite was happening, through the work of Joseph Harrison and Augustus Spencer. Harrison was the second principal of Leicester Art School and took the post in 1882. He had previously been deputy of Nottingham School of Art and he was more interested in design than fine art; his efforts to promote design, whilst still encouraging fine art and landscape work, led, in 1885 to the school changing its name and becoming Leicester School of Art and Design.[419] In 1888 Augustus Spencer was appointed principal of the School at Leicester, coming to Leicester from Coalbrookdale School of Art.[420] At this time, according to a local trade directory, classes at the School consisted of 'freehand drawing, shading, painting in oil and water colours, artistic anatomy, landscape painting, mechanical and architectural drawing, designing for art manufacture, geometry, lineal perspective and ornamental art'.[421] Classes were held in the mornings and afternoons for ladies and gentlemen, while classes for working people were held in the evenings.[422] In an effort to make training more relevant to students Spencer departed from the National Course of Instruction, letting students study objects they were more likely to come across in their work rather than those set out in Cole and Redgrave's curriculum. Students at Leicester were apparently much more enthusiastic about this way of learning, but the Department of Science and Art refused to recognise the changes Spencer had made.[423] Spencer believed that students at Leicester should be able to test the validity of their designs by making them, and set up a modelling class at the School in 1892, even though modelling was not recognised by the Department of Science and Art as being necessary

---

[418] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[419] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 68-9.
[420] *Ibid.*, p. 83.
[421] http://gimson.leicester.gov.uk/gimsonarts/leicester-school-of-art/ - accessed 30/11/14
[422] *Ibid.*
[423] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 88.

for a student's assessment.[424] Ambrose Poynter had stated to the 1849 Select Committee, and as quoted previously; 'they would be imperfect designs if they were not capable of being executed', and Spencer was now giving his students a chance to execute their designs.[425]

The aim of the School of Design was stated in the 1837 Select Committee report as being for the benefit of manufactures, and this had been restated during the 1840s.[426] Students were enthusiastic about having some practical experience in the schools (for example, in Gottfried Semper's classes), but manufacturers stated during the 1849 Select Committee that more practical work was required at the schools. In spite of this, Cole and Redgrave between them turned design education away from practical considerations and towards the mass education of the public in art and the training of art teachers, following a rigid and formulaic system imposed on all art schools across the country. While the first fifteen or so years of the School of Design under Papworth, Dyce and Heath Wilson may have been considered an experiment, with no one system of education being tried long enough to see how and if it worked, and the emphasis at the school swinging to and fro between practical work and fine art, the following fifty years, under the system of Cole and Redgrave were highly detrimental to the development of design education for the benefit of manufactures. Countries such as France and Bavaria had long had schools of design, and had long recognised the benefit of art to manufactures, not only was Britain late in realising the usefulness of art to industry with the relatively late (in comparison to foreign schools) founding of the School of Design, but events then transpired to divert art away from manufactures for around fifty years or more. Little wonder, then that by the 1930s, when the subject of design education and how it could be of use to manufactures, was raised again, the debates began to look all too familiar and it is in the following chapter that the debates in the 1930s are examined.

---

[424] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p. 93.
[425] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design: together with the proceedings of the committee, minutes of evidence, appendix and index* (1849) HC 576, 483-5.
[426] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the minutes of evidence, appendix and Index* (1836) HC 568, p v.

Chapter four: The beginnings of reorganisation: the 1930s

4.1 Introduction

After the long diversion of design education away from practical work under the influence of Cole and Redgrave, and the beginnings of a return to the original aims of the School of Design during the early 1900s, by the 1930s questions regarding what to teach design students were once again coming to the fore. This chapter argues that the historical context during the 1930s, however, moved concerns away from the need to produce designs to rival those from France and the need to provide an elementary art education to students; instead, by then, questions regarding what to teach design students were being raised within the context of increasing mechanisation, mass production and debates over how design education should respond to this. This chapter argues that the legacy of the National Course of Instruction created by Cole and Redgrave during the 1850s resulted, by the 1930s, in design education being at a crossroads. The strong teacher training emphasis of art schools needed to be addressed – particularly at the Royal College of Art (RCA) - and a decision made as to whether they were to continue in their teacher training efforts, or, given the increasing use of machinery and mass-production methods in many industries, re-focus their efforts back towards design and designing for industry. In addition, if design education *was* to be steered back towards its original aims of training people in design and design for industry, the question of whether that was to be via an 'art/craft' route or a more industrially focussed route, had to be addressed. Design education, then, was at a turning point. Mechanisation was taking place and designing for these new machines and processes also had to be considered alongside the craft work that art schools had introduced at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Art schools also found themselves catering for different groups of students, including those studying for their own improvement and enjoyment, those training full-time to be designers for industry, and those already employed in industry and who attended art schools on a part-time basis. All of these groups had different needs and required different training, and art schools had to find a way of providing this.

Two important reports produced during the 1930s attempted to address these issues: the Council for Art and Industry (CAI)'s third report, *Design and the Designer in Industry (D&DI)* (1937), was perhaps the first attempt to deal with art and design education from a less partial viewpoint than had been offered previously by governments and Select Committees.[427] In 1936 the Board of Education's *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (the Hambleden report) was published which recommended, among other things, the re-organisation of the RCA and a re-emphasis on its original aim of education for design for manufactures.[428] Both of these reports made recommendations for the future with regards to the training of designers and, anticipating an increase in the use of machinery and mass production, both reports discussed the need to provide more industrially-relevant training. Many of the recommendations made were similar to those made during the 1800s and serve to highlight the effects of Cole and Redgrave in steering art and design education on a path away from practical work in relation to industry. It is, therefore argued in this chapter that although the historical context within which debates on design education took place may have changed by the 1930s, the actual debates themselves had not.

4.2 The picture in the 1930s

In the 1930s the number of students training full time for design for industry at art schools was small in comparison to the overall number of students attending art

427 The Council for Art and Industry (CAI) was set up in 1933 following the 1932 Gorell Report into the *Production and Exhibition of Articles of Good Design for Every-Day Use.* The Council had three aims: the design education of the consumer; design training for those working in design; the encouragement of good design in relation to manufactures. The CAI was appointed and financed by the Board of Trade but was more independent in its make up, with representatives on the Council including industrialists, merchants, architects, artists and critics. The aim of the CAI was to improve the public's understanding of the benefits of design, and it was a direct antecedent of the Council of Industrial Design, which later became the Design Council. The Council for Art and Industry's third report, *Design and the Designer in Industry* was published in 1937 and dealt with the recruitment and training of designers. Among those providing evidence to the committee were Benjamin Fletcher, previously head of Leicester and Birmingham art schools and Director of Art Education in Birmingham, Kenneth Holmes, principle of Leicester College of Art and P. Jowett, principle of the Royal College of Art. Evidence was also received from the Federation of British Furnishing Textile Manufacturers and John Hooper, Chief Technical Officer for Furniture in HM Office of Works.
http://oxfordindex.oup.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095642700 - accessed 21/3/15

428 Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) ED 136/626 (The National Archives).

schools: the system of training within the factory or workshop, supplemented by some training at art school, which had generally been the case during the nineteenth century, was still widely used. Students who trained full time in an art school before going on to employment in industry were still very much in the minority. A consequence of Cole and Redgrave's emphasis on mass art education was that art schools had become the primary institutions for training art teachers, which led to large numbers of students attending art schools either intending to be art teachers, or who were already art teachers and wished to keep their skills up to date. The 1934 *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* report recorded the following statistics for 1934 regarding categories of students at art schools:

Total number of students at art schools	55857
Category A: 'will include industrial students in full-time employment'	19886
Category B: 'students taking full-time courses'	5578
Category C: 'all other students attending art schools'	30383[429]

The largest group of students – category C – were those who were evening or part time students attending 'for purely cultural reasons rather than with the object of obtaining instruction in connection with their employment or leading to employment'.[430] A substantial number of students in category C were, according to the report, already art teachers in primary and secondary schools or training colleges who wished to keep their skills up to date.[431] Whether the students in this category were studying for their own enjoyment or were art teachers wishing to keep their skills fresh, the fact that they comprise the largest group attending art schools in the 1930s demonstrates how far art schools had diverted from the original aim of being of benefit to manufactures. Instead of artisans and workers attending the art schools to supplement their factory training, the majority of art school students were art teachers and those studying for their own enjoyment.

---

[429] EMO'R. Dickey & WM. Keesey *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* (London, 1934) p. 6. The actual figures were 27173.5 women and 28673.5 men. The figures have been adjusted to whole numbers.
[430] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[431] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

The *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* report noted that the 19,886 men and women in category A were attending part-time and evening classes 'in subjects directly related to the industrial or commercial occupations in which they were engaged'.[432] These tended to be apprentices: students who were already employed but who 'may be released by his employer for a certain number of day classes, but is generally to be found in evening classes only'.[433] These apprentices were generally recruited to design rooms in factories and businesses at age 14 (which, in the 1930s, was the school leaving age), but were then trained 'in house', without much outside training in art schools. These students were the ones for whom the schools of design had originally been founded: artisans and workers already in employment who would benefit from some artistic training which could then be applied to their work. However, by the 1930s and resulting from Cole and Redgrave's intervention in the development of design education, these students did not comprise the majority at art schools. The smallest of the three categories, category B, consisted of students who were taking full time courses for the purpose of putting 'their artistic abilities to practical use in order that they might earn a living in one of the occupations of which these abilities are required, such as designing for manufacture, or teaching art, or both'.[434] This category, roughly 10% of the total number of students attending art schools, also included those training full-time to be art teachers, and thus it may be concluded that the number of students training full-time to be designers for industry was relatively small.

By 1937 student numbers attending art schools had risen to 62,015 from 55,847 in 1934, and 18.6% (11,534) were full-time students.[435] Of these, a small group were studying 'for purely cultural purposes' without necessarily intending to then go on and find a job related to their training, while a larger portion were training to be art teachers.[436] Within the remainder of full-time students (those not studying for their own improvement or to be art teachers), 'the larger proportion would…naturally tend at present to look to the practice of 'commercial art' or 'fine art' as offering better prospects than are generally

[432] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[433] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[434] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[435] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 35.
[436] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

available for the industrial designer'.[437] The issue of pay and prospects as a designer was also relevant to numbers of students training full time for industry, and teaching or commercial art were felt to be better careers than design for industry. The *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (the Hambleden report) noted that in 1936, 80% of the students who entered the RCA in that academic year stated their intention to become art teachers, as 'they saw no prospects of making a reasonable competence in any other artistic field'.[438] The report went on to note that 'few of those entering industry as designers have had any prospect of earning more than the salary of a routine worker'.[439] Similarly Cyril Kisby, who had studied at the RCA and was a lecturer in textile design at the Central School of Arts and Crafts expressed a similar view in a talk given to the RSA in 1937. He noted that 'Education authorities now find that many students, after several years spent in Art Schools or Colleges, are stranded, without hope of immediate employment…'.[440] Given that only 18% of students at art schools in 1937 were full-time, and the majority of these were training to become art teachers or studying for their own purposes, it can be seen that the number of students training full-time in art schools with the intention of becoming designers in industry was very small indeed. This was perhaps a relatively new group of students training in art schools; from the reports produced during the 1800s the impression was given that art schools ran classes during the day for 'ladies and gentlemen' – perhaps those who wished to improve themselves culturally or for whom drawing and painting were seen as acceptable pursuits. Classes in the evenings were for those who were already in employment and attended the art schools to gain some artistic training that might be applied in the workplace. There seems to be very little mention of students attending art school full-time and then entering employment in a similar manner to attending university and then finding work today. There is mention of students entering employment as designers after attending art school, but the impression is that they had previously been artisans and their art school training had allowed them to then be promoted and work as designers, rather than them having attended an art school full

[437] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[438] Board of Education *Report of the Advanced Committee on Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p 11. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[439] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[440] C. Kisby 'The Future Designer – from Elementary School to College' *Royal Society of Arts Journal* 86:4457 (1938: April 22) pp. 552-566.

time before finding employment. If this was the case – that students had not in the past trained full-time in art schools before entering employment as designers, then it is unsurprising that in the 1930s this group of students was very small.

4.3 Craft versus industry at Leicester and Birmingham

Both Leicester and Birmingham art schools had foreseen the need to consider the requirements of industry when training designers, and had introduced classes with a more practical and industrial outlook. Benjamin Fletcher had been headmaster of both Leicester and Birmingham art schools, and the favourable opinion of both schools in the 1930s can be credited to his awareness of the future needs of industry. Whether the cases of Leicester and Birmingham are unique amongst art schools is unclear, but they, at least, provide examples of art schools which, in spite of the rather restrictive curriculum imposed by the Board of Education, were attempting to provide training that was relevant to industry for their students.

By the 1930s mechanisation had happened or was happening, to a greater or lesser degree, across all industries and the feeling was that designers and design education needed to take this into consideration and adapt to it. The authors of both the Hambleden report and *Design and the Designer in Industry* anticipated an increase in mass production and therefore an increased need for more designers for industry, and the two reports set out recommendations as to how these designers should be trained. However, some art schools had already anticipated a need for more designers for industry; Leicester being one. Pevsner, in his 1937 investigation *Industrial Art in England* noted the work of Leicester's art school, saying that:

> the spirit and taste seem most gratifying, owing above all to Mr JB Fletcher who was the principal of the school from 1900-1920, i.e. during the time when the change from craft to industry became topical in all art schools. The Leicester College was one of the first English schools to realise the necessities of the new century and it had succeeded in impressing its ideas on more than one of the local trades.[441]

[441] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p 143-4.

Noel Carrington, the book designer and editor, also complimented the work of Fletcher, noting that 'The few exceptional schools, where on the initiative of a master who thought for himself, a realist attitude has been adopted, these schools – of which Leicester was perhaps the first and most famous because it combined technical and art instruction – only serve to throw into relief the inadequacy of the system as whole'.[442] A brochure published by the City of Leicester Education Committee in 1938 states that the range of courses provided by both the College of Art and the College of Technology 'is intended, not only to meet the needs of industry, but also to create new forms of skills, and, by doing these things, to confer a higher social statues upon the occupations concerned'.[443] It was also noted by Pevsner that the number of Leicester firms sending their apprentices to classes at the art school (and paying the fees for the classes) 'is much higher than in Birmingham – further proof that the untiring energy of an art school, continued over a sufficiently long period, can in the end convince employers'.[444] One of the departments within Leicester's art school was a School of Industrial Design which had been started in 1936, but the industrial design element of the School seems to only have existed in name. The School offered full time courses 'for students who wish to become artists or craftsmen, and for those wishing to train as Art Teachers', whilst day and evening classes were available for 'the study of art in relation to local trades and professions'; there was no mention of anything specific regarding designing for industry.[445] De Beaumont suggests that the main objective for the new department was to provide facilities in the College for students to become skilled in one particular trade, though this appears to be rather more akin to apprentice training than industrial design training.[446] Around 1929-1930 the College of Art and Crafts (as the Leicester art school was now called) had begun to share accommodation with the College of Technology, and the two institutions published a joint prospectus for the Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology. De Beaumont goes on to note that the College of Art, now sharing facilities with the College of Technology, was also able to cater for trades for which

---

[442] N. Carrington *Design in a Changing Civilisation* (London, 1935) p. 93.
[443] City of Leicester Education Committee *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology* (Leicester, 1938) No page numbers.
[444] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 144.
[445] *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1936-1937* p. 36.
[446] L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939* (unpublished MPhil: Leicester Polytechnic, 1987) p 193.

classes had previously only been taught in the College of Technology: boot and shoe design, and hosiery and knitwear design classes could now complement the craft-based classes for these trades which were held in the College of Technology.[447] The first chairman of the Council for Art and Industry Frank Pick noted in 1937 that Leicester had 'built up for itself a distinguished reputation for the extent to which it has secured co-operation not only between manufacturers and art schools, but between the art school and the technical school'.[448] This close co-operation between the Art College and Technical College - even to the extent of sharing the same building - was unusual, but in Leicester's case, seems to have had a positive effect. During 1936-37, classes in the School of Industrial Design were held in Pictorial Design, Poster and Advertisement Design, Design (which appears to be pattern construction and design and historic ornament), Confectionary Design, Textiles, Shoe Design, Writing, Lettering and Illumination, Jewellery and Metal Work, Pottery, and Window Display.[449] Cabinet Making, House Painting, and Decoration and Sign Writing had all moved from the School of Architecture and Building into the new School of Industrial Design. In 1938, the Department of Cabinet Making within the School of Industrial Design was described thus:

> Every effort is made to develop a high standard in design and craftsmanship. Stress is laid on the important function of this department in its relation to the trade, for to a great extent the training has taken the place of the old apprenticeship system. Although the department is fitted with machinery, students are encouraged to become fully conversant with traditional hand methods.[450]

Although Leicester was held up as 'model' example of an art school's system, Birmingham, where Fletcher had been principal after being at Leicester, was also praised by Pevsner, who wrote that after the First World War 'the necessary step was taken from the almost exclusive consideration of handicraft to the satisfaction of

---

[447] *Ibid.*, p. 193.
[448] K. Holmes 'Co-operation between manufacturers and art schools' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* vol. 85, no 4409 (May 21st, 1937) pp. 628-645 (introduction by Frank Pick).
[449] *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1936-1937* p. 41.
[450] City of Leicester Education Committee *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology* (Leicester, 1938) No page numbers.

industrial requirements' which Pevsner put down to the influence of Fletcher, who became headmaster of Birmingham's art school after his twenty years at Leicester.[451]

Fletcher's efforts at Birmingham had led to the art school there having, according to Pevsner, 'perhaps the most complete system of art education in the country'.[452] Birmingham's art school was large, and while, as Pevsner noted, 'the prevailing taste in the various departments is naturally uneven', in some classes it was described as 'conventional', and in others, including cabinet making, it was, according to Pevsner, 'excellent'.[453] Although Pevsner states that Fletcher wanted to satisfy 'industrial requirements' at Birmingham, the prospectus for 1935 still reveals a strong emphasis on arts and crafts, stating that the purpose of the School is 'for those intending to enter one of the artistic professions and for craftsmen, teachers and others' and for 'those who, as part of a liberal education, wish to widen their knowledge and appreciation of the arts and crafts…'.[454] Some efforts were being made with regards to a more industrial focus though: there was a School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship at Birmingham which had been set up in 1933 and ran one course, the aim of which was 'to give a sound training to those who wish to secure posts, or to improve their positions, in the various design studios and drawing offices, pattern shops and workshops, of the City of Birmingham and of the Midlands'.[455] The prospectus goes on to note that:

> The course of studies is specifically related to the needs of Midland Manufacturers. The work is carried out in co-operation with the craft classes and thus the department serves the purposes of an experimental workshop.[456]

Pevsner calls the development of this course 'promising, provided that it can be given sufficient authority amongst the existing crafts classes to secure an appreciative execution of the designs produced'.[457] The course lasted three years, full time, and subjects included the precious metal trades of goldsmithing, silversmithing and jewellery; light metal trades; architectural metal trades; furniture; shop fitting; interior

---

[451] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 139.
[452] *Ibid.*, p. 139.
[453] *Ibid.*, p. 140.
[454] *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1935-36* p. 12.
[455] *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-37* p. 22.
[456] *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-37* p. 22.
[457] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 151.

decoration or internal architecture; stage settings and shop window display, and draughtsmanship.[458] Pevsner investigated this course during his visit to Birmingham, and noted that its scope was 'gravely limited' due to the fact that the course did not allow students to produce their own work: 'The instruction given is limited to designing on paper, and therefore remains more theoretical than is desirable'.[459] As Pevsner noted, the Birmingham art school 'trains artists, architects, commercial artists, craftsmen, skilled workers and designers…..', but he was concerned that not enough was being done at Birmingham to aid the training of designers for industry.[460]

There was evidence that Leicester and Birmingham art schools had taken steps to provide their students with more practical and industrially focussed training than was set out in the Board of Education's curriculum, but in the main, but it seems these were the exceptions rather than the rule.[461] If the majority of students attending art schools were those already in employment and were attending art schools for some 'artistic' training to complement their employment, it can be argued that there was no need for art schools to give their training any industrial focus, as this knowledge could all be gained in the workplace. The issue seems to have been though, that on the one hand there was the learning in the art school – drawing and painting – and on the other was the practical work being done in the factory – the making of objects and goods. What was missing was the application and relevance of the learning to the making. It was all very well to teach students to draw and paint at the schools of design, but if there was no context to that teaching – how it could be used and applied to produce better-designed goods, then it was essentially useless. This was the issue during the 1800s; manufacturers noted during the 1849 Select Committee that training in the schools of design was not sufficiently practical; students were not being shown the relevance of what they were learning to what they did in their employment, and Cole and Redgrave's National Course of Instruction did nothing to help matters in this regard. Manufacturers

---

458 *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-37* p. 22.

459 N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 142.

460 *Ibid.*, p. 141.

461 The Department of Practical Art, suggested by Cole and set up as a subsidiary of the Board of Trade, became, in 1853 The Science and Art Department. This body existed until 1899, when it became the Board of Education and a governmental department in its own right, separate from the Board of Trade. In 1944 the Board of Education became the Ministry of Education.

did not expect schools of design to provide a complete training for students, but it seems what they did want was training that was at least relevant to a student's occupation. Leicester and Birmingham art schools realised that this was an issue which required addressing, and had introduced some more practical and relevant work to their students, but as noted at the end of the previous chapter, this was not well received by the Board of Education who wished all art schools to follow the same curriculum and examinations.

4.4 Mechanisation and the furniture industry

There may have been concerns regarding training for industry generally given the increasing mechanisation and mass production methods, but as far as the furniture industry was concerned, the situation was a little more complex and this was reflected in the training that students received at art school. The furniture industry was one of the last industries to become mechanised in contrast to, for example, the textile industry which had largely become mechanised by the mid-nineteenth century; Clive Edwards cites Raphael Samuel on this point, who noted that within the furniture industry mechanisation was a 'process and not an event'.[462] Mechanisation within the furniture industry had not happened to all processes at the same time; it had occurred gradually and only in some areas of the industry. It was during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that machines were introduced in the furniture industry and then to only certain parts of the industry. Edwards, writing in 1994, argues that the mechanisation of individual processes, at different rates, had caused problems for the furniture industry as a whole, noting that 'the dichotomy between the notion of a craft enterprise and a full blown business has been at the heart of the furniture industry's problems for much of the last one hundred years'.[463] The Board of Trade's 1946 Working Party Report on Furniture had investigated the rate of mechanisation within the furniture industry, and reported that it had taken place in two ways: firstly, 'special

[462] A. Forty *Objects of Desire: Design and Society since 1750* (London, 1995) p. 43 & C. Edwards *Stimulus and Response: An investigation into changes in the furniture industry between 1880-1920* (Royal College of Art: Unpublished MA thesis, 1988) p. 13.
[463] C. Edwards *Twentieth-Century Furniture: Materials, Manufacture and Markets* (Manchester, 1994) p. 107.

forms of fundamental implements have been developed for the cutting, fashioning, assembling and finishing of wood...', and secondly, 'mechanical power has been used to take the place of human muscle'.[464] Sparke noted the fact that differing processes became mechanised at different times within the furniture industry which led to a dualism, with some areas becoming 'standardisation, mechanisation and divided labour' while others kept a more craft oriented approach.[465] This dualism was seen in the prospectuses of both Birmingham and Leicester during the 1930s. Cabinet-making came within Leicester's School of Industrial Design, perhaps reflecting the recognition that furniture making was becoming more mechanised and 'industrial', but the day and evening courses were 'for the study of art in relation to local trades and professions', indicative of the view that there was still a strong art and craft base to furniture making in spite of the increasing use of machinery in the industry.[466] Likewise, at Birmingham, instruction in the School of Cabinet Making was based on 'sound craftsmanship', while the course in Industrial Design and Draftsmanship - which included the study of furniture – was carried out 'in co-operation with the craft classes'.[467] The examples of courses being called 'Industrial Design' at Leicester and Birmingham, but still retaining an art and craft emphasis illustrate the crossroads at which design education found itself in the 1930s. Mechanisation was occurring, though parts of the furniture industry still remained craft based. The question was how to navigate the fine line between retaining some art and craft emphasis whilst also taking into account new developments in machinery in the furniture industry and how art school training might achieve this.

It also seems to have been the case that in some areas within the furniture industry, design was still seen as something which was applied to an object, rather than being considered from the start of production, and thus training designers for industry would not have been a consideration. One example of such a practice was the application of decorative mouldings to furniture carcasses: the Furniture Working Party Report noted that 'many small firms rely entirely for the "design" of their furniture on mouldings and

---

[464] Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* (London, 1946) p. 83-4.
[465] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 7.
[466] *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus session 1936-7* p. 36.
[467] *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, prospectus 1936-7* pp. 14 & 22.

decoration purchased from specialist firms'.[468] Firms would, it seems, produce the carcass of an item of furniture – a wardrobe or sideboard – and then purchase mouldings and decoration in a particular style, which could then be applied to the carcass. The Working Party Report claimed that 'design came to be regarded not as a fundamental process which must be studied throughout, but as a mere adding of a few pieces of decoration at the end'.[469] If this were the case, furniture firms would have no real need for designers if 'design' were something applied to the product rather than a consideration of the overall whole of the piece.

4.5 Training for industry at the Royal College of Art

There were also concerns raised in the Hambleden report that the situation at the RCA was not favourable to industry. The College had in effect become a postgraduate institution by the 1930s, following a 1912 committee recommendation that it provide 'advanced work' for students upon leaving regional art schools and colleges.[470] However, the teacher-training element within the RCA remained strong; although some effort had been made to reorganise in the early 1900s, further developments had been hindered by the outbreak of war, and, as the Hambleden report noted, 'by 1920 the College had become largely a Training College for Teachers of Art'.[471] This was still the case into the 1930s even though the RCA was effectively a postgraduate institution; the percentage of students at the RCA who were training to be art teachers was proportionally higher than the overall percentage of students at all art schools training to be art teachers. This was legacy born out of the work of Henry Cole, as the Hambleden report noted: 'In the (18)'50s the growing demand for art teachers led to the college assuming for many years the training of such teachers as its principal function'.[472] In terms of art training, the RCA was felt to be successful, but not as far as design was concerned; the Hambleden report noted that this was partly due to the 'inadequacy of

[468] Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* (London, 1946) p 54.
[469] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[470] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 5. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[471] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[472] *Ibid.*, p. 5. Brackets mine.

the accommodation and equipment of the Design school', which had 'militated against its success in training designers for industry'.[473] Pevsner also wrote of the defects in equipment at the College, observing that:

> The equipment appeared scanty and hardly suitable for instruction in industrial methods. No clear division between the teaching of handicraft and design was made; but the spirit of the craft classes was cheerful and adventurous.[474]

The first recommendation of the Hambleden report was therefore that the RCA should reduce its teacher training and 'a new orientation should be given to the Royal College and that it should take the advanced study of all forms of Applied Art for its primary purpose'.[475] The intention was that existing art schools in big towns and cities should become regional colleges of art concentrating more on local industries, and students would move on to the RCA for advanced work if they desired.[476] The Hambleden report had an eye to the future, stating that 'The College of the future will have as its primary function the study of Industrial and Commercial art in its highest form'.[477] At the RCA in the late 1930s there was a School of Design, though rather like Birmingham and Leicester it seems to have been relatively craft based. Classes taught included Pottery, Silversmithing, Enamelling, Engraving, Stained Glass, Embroidery, Cotton Printing by hand, Frame-Making, Wood Carving, Painting and Decorating, Writing and Illumination, and Bookbinding. The prospectus for 1936-7 states that 'In the School of Design, practical workmanship in different classes is taken concurrently with the general drawing work of the studio, and every advanced student of Design will be expected to make himself proficient in the technique of one craft'.[478] The prospectus went on to note that 'All advanced students of Design will be expected to specialise their studies with a view to perfecting themselves on one branch of work and coming into touch with special forms of industry'.[479] Again there is mention of industry, but also of retaining a craft emphasis on the course. There was, though, the opportunity for

---

[473] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[474] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 153.
[475] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p 15. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[476] *Ibid.*, p. 15-16.
[477] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[478] *Royal College of Art Prospectus 1936-37* p. 16.
[479] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

students to spend time in factories or distributing houses; during the 1937-8 academic year, more than thirty students had done this in order to learn more about 'methods of production and display', while in 1938-9 a course had been started for all design students on 'how to present their work to employers, with reference to the special needs of the particular industry'.[480]

4.6 The furniture industry in the 1930s

The references to handicraft and craft techniques within cabinet-making and furniture courses during the 1930s reflected the state of the furniture industry at that time. As mentioned previously, mechanisation took place in stages within the furniture industry, and as the Working Party Report states:

> Until well into the mid nineteenth century furniture-making was essentially a handcraft trade and the tools and technique employed were little different from those that might be used today by the "handyman" making a piece of furniture in his spare time for his own use.[481]

Because of this, and as Sparke notes, the availability of cheap labour and the efficiency of the division of labour meant that machines weren't always needed within the furniture industry.[482]

Furniture manufacturers would have little need for designers if they were still primarily reliant on craft techniques in producing their goods, and there was a ready supply of craft workers who could fulfil those tasks; this would also explain why art school furniture courses were craft based until well into the twentieth century. Because certain parts of the furniture industry were very much craft based, it is also easy to see why the apprentice system of training also lasted until well into the twentieth century, and why full-time courses for furniture makers did not start being offered at Birmingham and Leicester art schools until 1945 and 1947 respectively. As individual firms would have

---

[480] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 121.
[481] Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* London, HMSO, 1946. p. 83. The Working Party Report recognised that these figures were not entirely accurate as there was an overlap with other industries such as joinery, ship-building and metal furniture.
[482] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 9.

had their own processes and ways of working, the most efficient way to train new employees was in the factory or workshop and release them for a day or an evening to go to art school to have a more rounded training. There was also an economic consideration when it came to purchasing machines, as Edwards comments. He notes that 'Mechanisation was a matter of choice for the producer, and it was a question of whether the process was going to be more profitable or cost effective than other ways of producing goods'.[483] The authors of the 1946 Working Party Report found that 'in large firms, particularly in the cabinetmaking section of the trade, the degree of mechanisation has been very considerable and that in consequence many of them have developed along mass-production lines broadly comparable with the technique employed in certain branches of the engineering industry'.[484] It was likely that larger firms were more able to afford to purchase machinery, or be willing to take a risk in investing in that machinery. The situation was different in small and medium-sized firms where there was 'considerable scope for improvement in machines and equipment', but possibly also less willingness to invest in machinery.[485]

The varying degrees to which mechanisation had occurred and the differing levels of willingness on the part of employers to invest in machinery would have impacted on the limited need for designers for industry – certainly within the furniture industry. Thus it is easy to see why provision for the training of industrial designers was still very much in its infancy in the late 1930s. According to Pevsner this was due to 'the small demand for well-trained designers in most trades…', a point that was also noted in the Hambleden report which observed that demand for designers for industry had previously been small, though this they put down to the existence of a large number of small firms that could not afford to employ a full-time designer, and a conservative public that preferred more traditional designs, so there was no requirement for original designs produced by designers.[486] The situation was starting to change though; a

[483] C. Edwards *Stimulus and Response: An investigation into changes in the furniture industry between 1880-1920* (unpublished MA thesis: Royal College of Art, 1988) p. 13.
[484] Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* (London, 1946) p. 53.
[485] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[486] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 145 & Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 11-12. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).

growing interest in design for mass production was evidenced by the founding of the Council for Art and Industry (1933), the work of Industrial Art Committee of the Federation of British Industries (1921), and the Design and Industries Association (founded in 1915).[487] There was a note of caution though: the Hambleden report's recognition that large numbers of full time designers for industry might never be needed if firms couldn't afford to employ them would mean that more freelance designers might be more utilised instead.[488] The *D&DI* also thought that the number of students studying full-time to be designers 'will in no case be very numerous, as the number of creative designers for whom employment can be provided in any given industry must always be limited'.[489] It was recommended that the RCA not initially train too many designers for industry, and should adjust its courses to accommodate demand in the future.[490] This was certainly a point which was of relevance to the furniture industry. The industry overall was not a large one; during the 1930s the number of workers was relatively small, especially when compared to other industries. The Working Party Report gave some statistics regarding the numbers employed in the furniture industry compared to other industries:

	Furniture[491]	Cotton spinning	Cotton weaving	Boot and shoe	Hosiery
1930	63500	183000	165000	144000	117000[492]

[487] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 14. ED 136/626 (The National Archive). The Federation of British Industries was founded in 1916 as the response of businessmen to war-time controls and set up its Industrial Art Committee in 1921. Among other activities, the Committee set up an Employment Bureau for industrial artists and arranged refresher courses for industrial designers at the RCA. See N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 155-157. The Design and Industries Association was started in London in 1915 with the aim of persuading designers and manufacturers to follow the principles of 'good design'. It was influenced by the Deutsche Werkbund, and its membership included handicraft teachers, craft-workers, architects, and those involved in manufacture or selling. It was independent of government, financed directly by its membership. http://www.vads.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/html/crd_desref.html - accessed 21/3/15.

[488] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 25. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).

[489] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937), p. 36.

[490] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 25. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).

[491] These were workers in what was called the 'Furniture industry proper', which was defined as those industries involved in 'the 'production of domestic furniture made of wood, including upholstery'. Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* (London, 1946), p. 45.

[492] Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* (London, 1946) p. 45-7.

By 1935 there were 75500 workers within the furniture industry, and 75900 by 1938.[493] Given the relatively small numbers working in the furniture industry in relation to other industries, it is not hard to understand why furniture designers may not have been in much demand within the industry, hence the caution of the Hambleden and *D&DI* reports.

There was in the 1930s, then, the situation where large numbers of students at art schools were training to be teachers, or were studying for their own enjoyment, and numbers of students training to be designers for industry was small. Parts of the furniture industry had become mechanised while others remained craft based, and while those involved in design anticipated a need for more designers for industry, in the 1930s furniture courses at art schools tended to remain craft based, in spite of being called 'industrial'. Art schools were starting to address the increasing mechanisation of industry and were beginning to realise that classes for designers would have to take this into account.

4.7 The supplemental role of art schools

Because large parts of furniture manufacture were still craft based, and processes and ways of working were probably specific to individual firms, the majority of training within the furniture industry took place within the factory or workshop. In the 1930s it does not seem to be the case that students went to art school for a period and then entered the furniture industry able to produce items of furniture; rather they tended to be apprenticed to a furniture firm which would then release students for a day to attend art school, or employees would attend evening classes at art schools in their spare time. The *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* report of noted that in 1934 there were 19,886 students were attending part-time and evening classes at art schools 'in subjects directly related to the industrial or commercial occupations in which they were engaged'.[494] These tended to be apprentices: students who were already employed but

[493] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[494] EMO'R. Dickey & WM. Keesey *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* (London, 1934) p. 6.

who ‘may be released by his employer for a certain number of day classes, but is generally to be found in evening classes only’.[495] Through the 1930s at the RCA Cabinet Making was not mentioned at all in courses in the School of Design, while at Birmingham classes for Cabinet Makers were for those ‘already engaged in the trade’, with classes held in the afternoons for apprentices and the evenings for journeymen.[496] Birmingham did offer some classes for pre-apprentices, who were to be trained to enter the furniture trade as apprentices, though it is not clear whether these courses were full or part-time. By 1939 Birmingham also offered a full-time course in Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship, which included Furniture within its syllabus, but there was no full-time course solely for furniture designers. At Leicester during the 1930s courses in Cabinet Making ran during the day and the evenings for apprentices only [497]

There is evidence that industrialists saw the role of the art school as a supplementary one, almost ‘finishing off’ the training given in the factory or workshop. The 1936 Hambleden report noted that art schools were seen by manufacturers as institutions for providing part-time training to their employees who had been recruited from elementary schools and junior art departments.[498] The industry view of the art schools seems to have been one of supplementing training provided in the factories, rather than to provide a complete training before students entered employment. As a result, there was a lack of co-operation between art schools and industry, partly due to industry not recognising the help that art schools could give with the provision of more fully trained designers.[499] Given the intermittent nature of design education in relation to industry followed by the emphasis on teacher training and a lack of practical work at design

---

[495] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[496] Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1930-31* & Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1939-40. Birmingham College of Art and Crafts prospectus 1930-31 Classes for Cabinet Makers* (separate leaflet) p. 2 & *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts prospectus 1939-40* p. 18 & 22.

[497] *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus for the session commencing 15 Sept 1930* p. 37 & *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus* p. 41.

[498] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 12. ED 136/626 (The National Archive). The report was so called after the Committee’s chairman, Viscount Hambleden. Among the witnesses to the Committee were William Rothenstein, previous head of the RCA, Percy Jowett and Athole Hay, Principal and Registrar of the RCA, and E Tristram, Head of the School of Design at the RCA.

[499] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 12. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).

schools through the late 1800s and early 1900s, it is hardly surprising that manufacturers were sceptical about the benefits of art education and its usefulness to industry. This lack of co-operation between manufacturers and art schools led, noted the Hambleden report, to a 'certain lack of realism in the training provided for students of design and to a failure in consequence to equip them with the understanding of industrial requirements which might render them of greater value to industry and more readily available to industrialists'.[500] The result was a rather negative cycle of events: a lack of co-operation between industry and art schools led to inadequate training, which led to even less co-operation between industry and art schools, resulting in more inadequate training. As Pevsner noted, lack of interest on the part of the manufacturers was mostly due to 'ignorance of the new tendencies in art schools, which are still considered 'crafty' and unpractical'.[501] He went on to say that many manufacturers dislike art schools because they want 'hands', and not people with an all-round training.[502] This was perhaps a legacy of the situation in the 1800s where classes were held in the evenings for artisans. The School of Design aimed to extend a knowledge of the arts and principles of design among the manufacturing people and as this was directed at those already in work, classes were held in the evenings for them to attend. Industrialists were, on the whole convinced that some artistic education would be beneficial to their workers, as were the workers themselves, but there was no suggestion of releasing workers to attend courses full-time at art schools, and the notion of full-time training before entering employment does not seem to have been widely held. There was a sense that art training was to complement what was learnt in the factories and enable artisans to produce better-designed goods, or to be able to interpret the drawings of a designer more accurately, and this feeling was carried over in to the twentieth century with classes for apprentices.

Whilst industrialists tended to view the role of art schools as supplementing the training offered in their factories and businesses, towards the end of the 1930s it was also the case that some art schools viewed their role as being to supplement industrial training. This was certainly the situation at Birmingham's art school. Within the School of

[500] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[501] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p 151.
[502] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

Cabinet Making, pre-apprentices, junior and senior apprentices and journeymen were all catered for, and the aim of the School was stated as giving 'a sound technical and art training to those already engaged in the trade', and to 'train suitable boys to enter the trade as apprentices'.[503] There was a consultative sub-committee for Cabinet Makers classes, which included members of the Birmingham and District Furniture Manufacturers and Allied Trades Association and members of the Birmingham Furnishing Trades Federated Committee, suggesting links between local furniture manufacturers and Birmingham's art school were quite strong.[504] The 1930-31 prospectus states that 'Classes for Cabinet Makers were established at the request of and in consultation with the trade, and a workshop has been furnished by the Birmingham and District Furniture manufacturer's association, with tools and a carefully chosen equipment with a view to practical work of a high standard and design'.[505] Evidently in Birmingham, at least, there was interest from the furniture trade in linking with the art school. Apprentices attended the School on certain afternoons each week and also went to evening classes. The aim of the School course was 'specially designed to help the young worker to become fully skilled by supplementing the workshop training with a graded course of work, beginning with simple pieces of construction and building up a sound knowledge of the craft'.[506] Within the School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship, students taking the course but who were already employed were 'able to supplement their workshop or office training'.[507] The prospectus goes on to say that 'This is very necessary as modern industry, with its specialisation and mass production methods, makes full training impossible'.[508] It was seen by those at Birmingham's art school that their role was to complement the training provided in industry so that students had a 'complete' training, whether they were apprentices or working in other roles. The 1937 *Design and the Designer in Industry* (*D&DI*) report, produced by the Council for Art and Industry, noted that 'A continued supply of skilled craftsmen is needed for actual manufacture also…' and went on to state that 'It is

---

503 *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-7* p. 3, & *School of Cabinet Making* (separate pamphlet) p. 2.
504 *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1936-37* p. 3.
505 *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1930-31* p. 15.
506 *Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1935-36* p. 16.
507 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
508 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

important, therefore, that in all trades that depend upon skilled craftsmanship steps should be taken to secure a wide experience and training for the young employees, so that they may learn to understand, not merely some detail of the process of production, but also the essentials of the process as a whole'.[509] It is interesting to note the language used in the Birmingham prospectus and the *D&DI* report. Birmingham's prospectus referring to mass production methods and modern industry making a full training impossible implies that the role of the art school was to provide the more artistic side of students' training – to complement what was learned in factories. The *D&DI* report seems to presume that it was the role of the art schools to give more of an industrial training to students – as if the skilled craftsmanship referred to in the report was what was learnt in employment, and it was for the art school to then introduce students to industrial processes. If art schools saw their role as providing the 'artistic' side to an apprentice's training and complementing what they learned in employment, but the authors of *D&DI* were implying that art schools should introduce apprentices to industrial processes, then the question of what to teach these students, and how, would not be resolved quickly.

4.8 The future – training designers for industry

Aside from apprentices and journeymen who worked on the shop floor in factories doing the 'making' of products, and who attended art schools on a part time basis in the evenings, there were two other groups of students attending art schools, and it is these two groups which are the focus of *Advanced Art Education in London* (the Hambleden report) and *D&DI* reports; neither of these two reports deal with apprentices and journeymen. First was the small number of full-time students training to be designers, a group anticipated to grow in number and which required a comprehensive training at art school, and referred to as 'art students' in the *D&DI* report. Second were those who were already working in a design-room in a factory in some capacity and who may have the ability to go on and become fully-fledged designers. These were students who tended to have been recruited from school at age 14 and trained 'in house', rather than

[509] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 21.

having completed a full-time design course at an art school and then entering the design-room fully qualified: they were referred to as 'industrial students' in the *D&DI* report. These students often attended art schools part-time in the evenings and were recognised by the Hambleden and *D&DI* reports as requiring a different sort of training to students attending art school full-time.[510]

4.8.1 Industrial students

There were almost 20,000 industrial students attending part-time classes at art school during the 1930s, usually in the evenings, taking classes related to their daytime employment, and the *D&DI* report states that 'Arrangements for the part-time training in the art schools of industrial employees are most important…'[511] The report went on to comment that the system of training design room staff 'in house' could at best be described as 'restricted in outlook and incomplete', and could also be detrimental to the design of products, as the in-house training 'represents a process of inbreeding…..the dangers involved are great'.[512] The concern was that one designer would teach another and so ways of working and designing would be replicated, leading to rather stale and uninspired designs with no fresh input or ideas coming in.[513] There was also the concern that the separation of designing and manufacturing as brought about by the introduction of machinery could also be detrimental to design:

> A further danger arises, at any rate in some cases, from the almost complete separation of the design room from the actual manufacturing process. We have received evidence that drawings are sometimes sent our from the design room which have been prepared without any regard to the methods of manufacture. This is, for instance, sometimes the case with furniture design. From a paper sketch, which is an illustration rather than a design, the practical designing is done by the works foreman whose abilities for this purpose are possibly confined to manual skill and a sound knowledge of the forms of construction. Cases were brought to our notice where the finished product is never seen by the design room staff, who, therefore, have no opportunity of supervising the

[510] Although the Hambleden report was concerned with art education in London, recommendations it made regarding the training of designers were also echoed in *Design and the Designer in Industry*, and are therefore pertinent to the thesis as a whole.
[511] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p 32.
[512] *Ibid.*, pp. & 23.
[513] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

> execution of the design and do not even gain experience by learning how it had worked out in actual making.[514]

The *Design and the Designer in Industry* report did note that there were some companies that trained their staff well, but went on to state that 'we are satisfied that, in modern conditions, a training and an experience which are limited to the design room and the factory will not by themselves prove sufficient to secure the fullest development of the capacities of the staff, or to keep alive such inventive abilities as they may possess'.[515] In other words, additional training at an art school was required. In order to provide additional training to industrial students, part time attendance at art school was desirable to the authors of the *D&DI* report, but they did not think it was 'wise or reasonable that industry should continue to rely on supplementary training for its employees which is dependent on their own spare-time efforts'.[516] It was noted that students who attended art school in the evenings were generally tired after a day at work and may not get the most out of the art school classes.[517] It was also observed that 'in the industries of….cabinet making…there is a growing practice of releasing employees during working hours for courses of technical and other instruction relating to their occupations'.[518] The *D&DI* report thought this was a far better way of providing training to employees and went on to recommend that manufacturers should consider adopting the scheme of releasing their employees during the day to attend art school; as the report noted, 'practically nothing comparable to this is to be found in the case of the design room staffs…'.[519] It was for the art schools to provide 'appropriate courses which would be attended by member of the design room staffs…..and they must be based on a clear demarcation between the training required in the school or college and that given in the factory'.[520]

The *D&DI* report noted that it was the role of the art school to develop the artistic capacities of the industrial students, 'to lead them to a wider appreciation of art in

---

[514] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[515] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[516] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[517] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[518] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[519] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[520] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

relation to design, and to afford them the outlets for self expression which may be unobtainable during their daily work'.[521] A note of caution was sounded though, that this art school education should be directly related to a student's work in the factory, and the authors of the *D&DI* report thought that 'close and continuous liaison should be maintained between the factory and the school and that both sides should realise that they are engaged in a joint enterprise with a common aim'.[522] During the 1849 Select Committee one witness, Charles Richardson, RIBA member and master of architecture and perspective at the School of Design, had been aware of this, noting that if the work of art schools was more practical and masters were allowed to instruct their pupils in design, 'artisans would come to the school in shoals…'.[523] It seems that if students could see that the education they were receiving in art school was relevant to their occupation they would be more likely to attend art school. There may well have been a motivation in terms of increased pay or status: if a student attended art school and subsequently produced better work he or she might well gain a pay rise or promotion.

4.8.2 Art students

Art students were defined as those who would enter industry as in the 'higher ranges' and were talked about in terms of 'qualified staff designers', 'artist-craftsmen' or 'free-lance designers', and the *D&DI* report recognised that these full-time students required different training from that of their part-time counterparts.[524] Regarding full-time students, the issue 'therefore, that has to be solved is how best to provide for the training of a limited number of selected students, so that they may become a body of creative designers for industry…'.[525] *D&DI* felt that in the case of full-time students, it was for the art school 'to produce a designer who, before long, will be able to take his place in industry and to grasp the problems presented by design under the conditions of

[521] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[522] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[523] *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (1849) HC 576, 1491.
[524] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 35.
[525] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

production'.[526] The intention was, then, that art schools should provide as complete a training as possible for full time students, in contrast to the supplementary training given to apprentices and those already in employment. The Council for Art and Industry felt that art schools should give students some understanding of technical knowledge and the technical requirements of industry, but, at the same time 'the art school cannot and must not be expected to turn out finished designers who are capable immediately of taking their full place in industry'.[527] It was though, for the 'employer, not the art school to ensure they have all the experience of methods or processes desirable to manufacturing'.[528] This comment seems to be reasonable, given that each firm would have its own unique way of working and may employ slightly different processes from another firm producing the same product.

As Cyril Kisby commented, the present system of education for full-time students was that they attended art college for four or five years after going to secondary school, and sat the Board of Education examinations.[529] On the results of these, students could either then enter industry, or a scholarship could be awarded which allowed the student to then attend the RCA for an additional three or four years.[530] Kisby stated that 'During all these years of study, they have had little or no contact with industry, although some form of craftwork will have been studied in order to satisfy the requirements of the examiners'.[531] *Design and the Designer in Industry* also recognised that however good the art school training was, and whatever the extent to which it related to industry, actual industrial experience was still necessary and it was felt that once art school students were employed in industry they would need up to a year to find their feet and get to know the processes of their particular firm.[532] Some industrialists saw this year of 'settling in' in rather a different light, complaining that they had to spend time 're-training' the art school student, but as *Design and the Designer in Industry* suggested,

---

[526] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[527] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[528] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[529] C. Kisby 'The Future Designer – from Elementary School to College' *Royal Society of Arts Journal* 86:4457 (1938: April 22) pp. 552-566.
[530] *Ibid.*, pp. 552-566.
[531] *Ibid.*, pp. 552-566.
[532] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 35.

what this actually meant was that students had to become accustomed to factory conditions before what they had learnt at art school could be applied in the factory setting.[533]

Walter Gropius, one of the contributors to the Hambleden report, and the founder of the Bauhaus, had confirmed that attempting to replicate factory conditions *within* the art school was not practical but that some 'basic multi-purpose machines' would be useful.[534] Gropius considered that the best place to study large-scale processes and machinery was the factory itself, which led to the Hambleden committee's recommendation that students should 'if possible, spend some time in a factory studying actual conditions and processes of large scale production' during their courses, as well as having the opportunity to 'bed down' in industry once they had graduated.[535] Harold Sanderson, more than likely the Harold Sanderson from the wallpaper company Sanderson and Co, echoed the view of Gropius, and commented to the Royal Society of Arts in 1937 that allowing students into the factory to see what was being done and how processes worked;

> is what can and should be done for a student in any up-to-date manufacturing concern'. There is no way to-day you can so well educate your students for entry into industry as by bringing them into the very centre of the factory and letting them work with artists and craftsmen, and absorb the processes for themselves.[536]

4.9 General skills

Although the industrial students and art students were seen as two distinct groups which required particular training, the authors of the Hambleden and *D&DI* reports felt that there were some elements of art and design education which would be relevant to both groups. Both the Hambleden and *D&DI* reports confirmed that one of the most important skills an art school student needed to posses was an artistic ability. The *D&DI*

---

[533] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[534] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p 27. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[535] *Ibid.*, p. 27-28.
[536] K. Holmes 'Co-operation between manufacturers and art schools' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* vol. 85, no 4409 (May 21st, 1937) pp. 628-645.

report notes that 'all or most witnesses attached much importance to the acquirement by students of sound artistic technique', while the Hambleden report notes that a designer should first and foremost be an artist, and that their 'essential qualification must be ability to draw'.[537] This was almost certainly a legacy from the 1800s and the emphasis on correct drawing that had been the focus of the schools of design. At Birmingham during the 1930s, drawing was part of the curricula; the prospectuses state that it is necessary to 'supplement the technical skill by a knowledge of drawing…', and that 'Training is also given in drawing…' [538] Similarly at Leicester, all courses for cabinet makers in the late 1930s included drawing.[539] Prospectuses for the RCA state that 'In the School of Design practical workmanship in different classes is taken concurrently with the general drawing work of the studio…'; additionally 'Memory and observation drawing form an important part of the work of the School' and 'All students of the School are expected to study-life drawing'.[540] Drawing was seen as an important skill as it would enable the student to both produce designs that could be interpreted and/or then made by others if they were a designer, or, if they were a worker, knowledge of drawing would enable them to accurately interpret a design they were given. Drawing then was important both for the production and interpretation of designs.

Design and the Designer in Industry noted that 'the training must not be confined merely to practice of designing on paper, but should be related to the actual commodities with which it is to be associated, and should include the handling of the

---

[537] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 30 & Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 27. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).

[538] *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham Prospectus 1933-4 (Classes for Cabinet Makers separate leaflet)* p. 2; *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham Prospectus (School of Cabinet Making separate leaflet) 1934-5* p. 2; *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham Prospectus 1935-6 (School of Cabinet Making separate leaflet)* p. 12; *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham Prospectus 1936-7 (School of Cabinet Making separate leaflet)* p. 2; *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1937-8 (School of Cabinet Making separate leaflet)* p. 2; *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1938-39* p. 18.

[539] For example: *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1935-1936* p. 53; *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus session 1937-1938* p. 41 & *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1939-40* p. 41.

[540] Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1933-1934* p. 15 & 16; Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1936-1937* p. 16 & 17; Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1939-1940* p. 23 & 24.

materials, some instruction in the processes of manufacture …'.[541] The usefulness of being able to work with various materials had also been noted by the Hambleden report which stated that a student 'cannot fail to be enhanced if he is equipped with some practical experience of the nature and handling of materials and a knowledge of the potentialities and limitations of industrial production both as regards the raw material itself and the processes through which it goes'.[542] Likewise witnesses for the *D&DI* report generally agreed that 'a firm grasp of the essence of design can only be obtained in relation to a given material and the handling of it'.[543] These comments are perhaps indicative of how far from the aims of the first School of Design that design education had strayed; during the 1837 Select Committee report it was noted by Thomas Donaldson that handling of the materials would be useful for a designer's training, and one hundred years later the same recommendations were being made.[544] While practical work had been reintroduced into art schools in the late 1800s and early 1900s and presumably would have included some knowledge of the materials with which students were working, what is interesting is that the recommendation that handling of the materials was necessary had to be made at all in the Hambleden and *D&DI* reports. Had practical work remained a constant in art schools since 1837, it could be argued that a handling and knowledge of the materials being used would be a given in the training provided at art schools, and not an issue which had to be specifically reiterated in the 1930s. Related to the handling of materials and their use in products was the issue of their cost. The Hambleden committee recommended that 'courses in the economic aspects of industry, costs, market considerations, problems of distribution and the like…should be added to the curriculum'.[545] This was also echoed in *Design and the Designer in Industry,* which recommended that 'it would be a distinct advantage to the art student who is training to become an industrial designer if he could acquire some knowledge of the elements of costing and marketing and business organisation'.[546] It

---

[541] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 31.
[542] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 26-27. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[543] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 30.
[544] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* House of Commons (1836) HC 568, II – 344-5.
[545] Board of Education *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 28. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[546] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 31.

was all well and good for students to be coming up with well-designed products, but if the materials needed, and the methods required to make the product were too expensive, it would never be produced.

4.10 How should art schools be structured?

There was some discussion by the Council for Art and Industry as to the type of institution that should exist for the training of full-time designers, although given the acknowledged small numbers of full-time design students it is not surprising that this discussion did not change anything regarding the set-up of art schools. The authors of the *D&DI* report cited the monotechnic institution that was often seen on the Continent; aside from the London School of Printing and the Scottish Woollen Technical College no similar institutions existed in Britain in the 1930s.[547] The examples were given of the Glass School in Zelezny Brod (Czechoslovakia), the Pottery School in Karlsbad (Prussia), or the Textile School in Berlin which were described in the 1934 *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* report as 'industrial schools fully equipped with modern machinery of a type seldom if ever found in an English art school, and staffed by artists of real ability who have an inside knowledge of industrial conditions and who are assisted by trade instructors'.[548] The authors of *Design and the Designer in Industry* recognised that such institutions could be advantageous in fully developing the training for one particular industry, but felt that there was a danger that instruction could develop too narrowly.[549] There was also the feeling that different parts of design were interrelated: furniture, textiles and pottery should all harmonise in the interior decoration of a home, and students would therefore benefit from coming into contact with other branches of design while studying their specific subject.[550] The *D&DI* report also noted that while the school at Karlsbad was a monotechnic for pottery, the 'highest type of pottery design' was also being taught at the Central School of Arts and Crafts in

[547] *Ibid.*, p. 36. A study of these schools (among others) had been made in the Board of Education report *Industry and Art Education on the Continent* (1934), which had been read and considered by the authors of *Design and the Designer in Industry.*
[548] Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[549] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p 36.
[550] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

Prague, proof to the authors of *D&DI* that a polytechnic school could also provide courses of the highest standards.[551] Whilst the possibility of a future monotechnic institution for a specific industry was not discounted for England, it was felt that rather than replicate a system in place on the continent, the current system of art schools 'which provide for a wide variety of purposes to an extent which is probably unknown in any of the foreign countries visited…' should remain, and it seemed clear that 'our aim should be to… strengthen this characteristic width of scope of our schools, while at the same time we must graft on…more workmanlike and complete facilities for serving specific needs…'.[552] The *D&DI report* recommended that 'in the major industrial centres there will be developed art colleges' which would pay 'particular attention to the needs of any important staple industries that may exist in the locality, and that in such centres there will be full and proper provision for the requirements of that staple industry and an ordered system of training which will receive its full support'.[553] The intention was that within art schools a department would be developed which was fully capable of dealing with the training for the particular local industry, including artistic and technical design and commercial considerations.[554] However, these new art colleges were not to become too specific; they should also develop 'a real width of outlook which will secure that colleges shall be alive to the constant necessity for research and experiment, shall keep an observant eye on development and change at home and abroad, and shall maintain touch with what will advance design in industry'.[555] Closer links with regional technical colleges should be formed so that there was not too much overlapping of courses and resources: the case of Leicester was again cited and it was noted that the art and technical schools shared the same building and 'with a minimum overlapping of equipment the hosiery knitting industry appears to be served most efficiently'.[556] Pevsner noted in 1937 that:

> The most characteristic feature of English as compared with typical Central European Art Schools is that their activities are so much wider and more varied. A completely developed English art school would run a full-time junior department…afternoon courses and evening courses for skilled workers,

[551] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[552] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[553] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[554] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[555] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[556] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

> craftsmen and some designers, craft classes for amateurs and future independent artist- craftsmen, art classes for future artists and courses for teachers. That means that one institution in this country fulfils the same purpose as four or five different schools in Germany….[557]

This was perhaps the crux of the issue. It seems that the intention was that art schools in England would fulfil a number of roles and train a wide range of people and could perhaps be spreading themselves too thinly. Given that, as *Design and the Designer in Industry* recognised, part-time 'industrial' students and full-time 'art' students required completely different training to each other, it might have been sensible to separate the training of part time students from that of full time students into separate colleges. Rather than split institutions by course, as happened on the continent, it might have been wise to split by the type of training required, though this would have led to a replication of equipment in various colleges, which could have been expensive. This was perhaps again a legacy of the lack of clear direction which had characterised the schools of design in their early years. From the start they had held daytime classes, which were attended by ladies and gentlemen – not the workers for whom the schools were intended – before evening classes were introduced for the workers to attend after their working day had ended. Already, then were two quite separate groups of people attending the art schools. By the 1860s when Cole and Redgrave's National Course of Instruction was well established, those training to be art teachers constituted a third group attending art schools. Come the 1930s then, students attending art schools fell into several groups: those studying for their own enjoyment and improvement; apprentices, pre-apprentices and journeymen; those already working in design rooms and drawing offices who attended part time; students training to be full-time designers; students training to be art teachers; those who were already art teachers and wished to keep their skills fresh. Art schools had to try and provide training for these quite distinct groups of students which in itself was a complicated task; apprentices and journeymen were thought to require more art and craft related training, as were students working in design and drawing offices and art teachers, while those training to be designers for industry required more industrially-relevant training with some knowledge of processes and machinery.

---

[557] N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England* (Cambridge, 1937) p. 149.

4.11 The 1930s: a summary

As this chapter has demonstrated, the activities and purpose of art schools during the 1930s present a complex picture, highlighting that art and design education had reached a crossroad regarding its aims and intentions. There was a recognition that the original aims of the schools of design as existing to provide art education for artisans which could then be applied to industry had been lost, and therefore there was a desire to re-focus the RCA back towards design and training for industry in order to address the fact that the College had become essentially a teacher training institution during the previous decades. There was also the realisation that production methods in industry were changing, and therefore for art and design education to remain relevant to industry – one of the aims of the schools of design – the type of training offered in art schools needed to be reconsidered. However this was alongside a continuing need for skilled craftsmen in some industries – certainly in the furniture industry – and many art schools still emphasised the importance of craft skills. At the same time, the importance of certain skills that had been thought necessary during the 1800s, such as drawing and the handling of materials were also being reiterated. Art and design education was caught in the tension between looking forward and orienting towards the future needs of industry and mass production, or continuing to provide craft-based skills to students for those parts of industry that still required it, whilst ensuring that skills such as drawing were not lost. Art schools were also attempting to cater for very different groups of students – from those attending the schools for their own enjoyment, to those training to be designers for industry, as well as for apprentices and art teachers. Recommendations regarding the way forward had been made in both the Hambleden and *Design and the Designer in Industry* reports, however, world events delayed the implementation of these recommendations with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. It was not until 1946 that significant changes were made to art and design education and these are examined in the following chapter.

Chapter five: A return to design focussed education? 1946 - 1967

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the period 1946 – 1967 and examines two structural changes in design education, starting with the first major restructure of the curriculum and examination system when the National Diploma in Design (NDD) was introduced in 1946. With war-time production methods being increasingly utilised by industry, it was now more urgent than ever that art and design education address the training that it provided its students in order to be relevant to industry. This chapter proposes that it was the NDD which represented the most effective solution to the question of how designers should be trained for industry to that point; the NDD was much more vocational than previous design education qualifications and students could specialise in one or two subjects. While the NDD did come in for some criticism – and it was not perfect – its intention to provide practical training to students was worthy. The introduction of the NDD was also the first time that art schools were given an element of freedom in constructing their own courses rather than having to follow a prescribed curriculum. This chapter also demonstrates that post-war changes to higher education more generally began to affect art and design education; the government was keen to divest itself of responsibility of the art schools and, in a move to bring art and design education on a par with university degrees, replaced the NDD with the Diploma in Art and Design (Dip A.D) in the early 1960s. The chapter makes evident that the historical context of this period is one of external changes affecting art and design education; the need to respond to mass-production and increasing mechanisation in industry, the expansion of higher education in the post-war period, and the increasing freedom awarded to art schools to design their own courses.

This chapter is also a fresh narrative for the period 1946-1960 at least as far as developments in art and design education are concerned. The history of the RCA during this time has been documented by Frayling, while Strand has traced developments in policymaking between 1960 and 1982 in his work. Piecing together developments from

1946 to 1960 has been somewhat complex, made no easier by the very similar sounding names of various committees and councils during this time. By utilising various reports produced by these bodies, a narrative has been produced which documents policymaking in art and design education for this period.

5.2 The Royal College of Art, Birmingham and Leicester during the war years

Many of the recommendations in the Hambleden and *Design and the Designer in Industry* reports were delayed in their implementation due to the outbreak of the Second World War. The RCA, Leicester and Birmingham art schools all continued with classes during the war years, although it is not clear if these were on a reduced basis in terms of both student numbers and classes held; if the pattern at Leicester's art school during the First World War was repeated across all art schools during the Second World War, student numbers would certainly have been significantly reduced.[558] Prospectuses for Leicester art school are missing from the archive for all sessions from 1941-2 to 1946-7 inclusive, though the school did continue to operate during the war. Students and staff were engaged in war-work and produced, for the city health department, among other items, bed rests, bed trays, splints, bedside cabinets, crutches, stretcher trolleys, instrument cupboards and operating tables as well as beds, wardrobes and dining tables for nurses' residences. For the Ministry of Supply the staff and students also produced tables, chairs, cupboards and bedroom furniture for hostels serving the workers in ordinance factories.[559] The prospectus for the session 1940-1 for Birmingham's art school is missing from the University archive, and from 1941 to 1944 the school issued a four-page abridged prospectus. These give lists of courses available, timetables and fees, but no further information. In 1946 prospectuses become more comprehensive again, with a separate but abridged prospectus issued for the School of Furniture and Allied Crafts.

[558] In 1911 Leicester had 2152 students; in 1916 this had dropped to 1142 students, and in 1921 this had increased again to 3042 students. See *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology* (Leicester, 1938).
[559] *Leicester College of Art War Work 1939-45* (Designed and printed by Leicester College of Art School of Printing, 1947) No page numbers.

In a similar manner to Birmingham the RCA issued a 'duplicate' prospectus during the war years – a handwritten insert in the 1941-2 prospectus reads;

> During the war 1940-1945 an Abridged Prospectus was used. In 1941-42 these were printed slips issued. Afterwards only a duplicate slip was used. Prospectus was resumed 1946-47.[560]

Due to the bombing in London during 1940, the Board of Education decided that the RCA should be evacuated from the city for the duration of the war; two hotels in Ambleside in the Lake District were chosen, and the college relocated there for the next five years.[561] As Percy Jowett, then principle of the RCA noted, 'we could not bring much of our heavy equipment with us', meaning many of the looms, presses, kilns, furnaces and potters' wheels had to be left in London. This disruption delayed the implementation of the recommendations in the Hambleden and *Design and the Designer in Industry* reports.

5.3 The Society of Industrial Artists, the Ministry of Education and the Board of Trade

Although the work of art schools was severely curtailed during the war years and immediately afterwards, matters of art and design education were not completely disregarded. In 1944 The Society of Industrial Artists (SIA) published a memorandum entitled *The Training of Designers for Industry: Proposals for improving the education and status of the Artist-designer* and in 1946 the Ministry of Education published its pamphlet *Art Education,* which outlined the Ministry's aims for art education in primary and secondary education and beyond.[562] This pamphlet dealt with art education across the whole of the education system, and while not as detailed as other reports dealing solely with the work of art schools, it does echo concerns already outlined in

---

[560] *Royal College of Art Prospectus 1941-1942* Handwritten note stuck to page 5.
[561] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 121.
[562] Society of Industrial Artists *The Training of Designers for Industry: proposals for improving the education and status of the Artist-designer* (London, 1944) ED 46/154 (The National Archives) & *Art Education: Ministry of Education pamphlet number 6* (London, 1946).

Design and the Designer in Industry and also overlaps with issues raised in the SIA's report.

The SIA noted that, 'hitherto design had not been regarded as a process of thought...', which was a correct statement given that art was previously called 'applied' and was regarded as something done to an object or, in the case of furniture design, added on at the end by way of mouldings and veneers, rather than taken as part of the whole manufacturing process.[563] The SIA also commented that the need for designers for mass production was an issue that deserved attention;

> Little distinction is as yet made between the requirements of modern mass production and the handicrafts…The rapidly expanding mechanisation in all branches of productive industry, with its demand for a fundamentally different design technique, has not been appreciated.[564]

The main contention of the SIA was that the current curriculum in art schools was 'not sufficient to meet the requirements of the industrial designer', and, considering that courses in the 1930s were still heavily craft-oriented, this was a reasonable assertion to make.[565] However, as demonstrated the previous chapter, there was a growing realisation that more had to be done to adapt to changing manufacturing and production methods, and had the Second World War not impeded progress in this regard, the SIA's comments would perhaps not have arisen. Equally, it was recognised that the demand for designers for industry had been, and still was, very small, so again, the SIA's comments were perhaps overly critical.

Echoing the recommendations of both the Hambleden and *Design and the Designer in Industry* reports, the SIA report presented the purpose of art school training as the provision of 'a grounding in the basic principles of industrial production, and to develop the qualities of perception, draughtsmanship, planning and technical understanding': the report also noted that a two-year standard course would be sufficient to learn these principles.[566] The first year of the two-year course should include composition, freehand

---

[563] Society of Industrial Artists *The Training of Designers for Industry: proposals for improving the education and status of the Artist-designer* (London, 1944) p. 2. ED 46/154 (The National Archives)
[564] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[565] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[566] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

and geometric drawing, and the handling of materials, while the second year of the course would include more technical work.[567] While not dictating the length or type of course a student should undertake, the Ministry of Education's *Art Education* pamphlet agreed with the SIA on the things students should be taught. It was noted that 'A department of drawing and painting will always be an essential element in an art school', and students' 'artistic education shall be soundly based in the ability to draw.'[568] However crafts were still to be included in the curriculum, at least in the first year of the course, so that the student had a chance to have a wide background to his or her studies, and also to see where their strengths might lie.[569]

After completing the two year standard course, the SIA suggested that students undertake an advanced course - presumably similar to what was offered at the RCA- which should include 'the study of relevant materials and processes, the history of the industries concerned, and present-day methods and developments'.[570] Likewise, *Art Education* also advocated the need for students to have experience of handling materials and their various properties: 'The designer for machine-produced goods manufactured by modern methods will need to have a real understanding of the possibilities of plastics and other synthetic materials, as well as of the many process of fabrication now employed in factories'.[571]

The SIA went on to suggest that art school courses also included marketing, instruction in 'works progress and control', and costing; a recommendation already made by both the Hambleden report and *Design and the Designer in Industry.* This was confirmed again in *Art Education* where it was recognised that knowledge of costing and production would be useful as it was already part of the curriculum in Continental schools and 'there is good reason to feel that there is room for more of this kind of thing

---

[567] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[568] *Art Education: Ministry of Education pamphlet number 6* (London, 1946) p 36.
[569] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[570] Society of Industrial Artists *The Training of Designers for Industry: proposals for improving the education and status of the Artist-designer* (London, 1944) p. 4. ED 46/154 (The National Archives)
[571] *Art Education: Ministry of Education pamphlet number 6* (London, 1946) p. 33-4.

in our country'.[572] The *Art Education* pamphlet also agreed with the recommendations laid out in the Hambleden report and *Design and the Designer in Industry* that students should have some industrial experience: 'For the student who intends to become an industrial designer, real works experience is, of course, very much to be desired.'[573] This is reiterated further on the in the report: 'A very useful contribution can be made by the industrialist in taking students into his firm for part-time works experience during their training, for it is of the greatest advantage to the intending designer to have had the experience of working under actual industrial conditions as part of his course'.[574]

Like the SIA, the Ministry of Education recognised the need for more designers for industry, but stated that one of the aims of art colleges was to 'provide the training required for those who may take up artistic careers, more especially in industries which depend on good design and craftsmanship'.[575] The overall purpose of art schools was that they should, according to the Ministry of Education, 'bring to bear on matters of design in industry and commerce the fund of artistic knowledge acquired by the designer in the study of purely artistic problems'.[576] The *Art Education* pamphlet made special mention of both Birmingham and Leicester art schools when it noted that one of that improvements made to design education was allowing students not just to design on paper but also to undertake practical work:

> it was left to a few far-seeing people in the schools themselves to realise that the proof of the success of a design lay in the making, and that it was through practical work in the material that the designer should be educated. This method was adopted by pioneering schools such as the Colleges of Art at Birmingham and Leicester...[577]

Given the above statement, which implies that it was not a government decision that students should actually have experience in making their designs, but an initiative which

---

[572] Society of Industrial Artists *The Training of Designers for Industry: proposals for improving the education and status of the Artist-designer* (London, 1944) p. 4. ED 46/154 (The National Archives) & *Art Education: Ministry of Education pamphlet number 6* (London 1946) p. 34.
[573] *Ibid.*, p. 37-8.
[574] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[575] *Ibid.*, p. prefatory note.
[576] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[577] *Ibid.*, p. 26

had come from within some art schools (and which at the time had been disapproved of by the Board of Education), the Ministry of Education's comment seems rather ironic;

> it is interesting to reflect that a hundred years ago committees were recommending the setting up of schools of art which should be something more than academies of fine art and should render real service to industry. If the members of those committees were to come back to earth and see some of the most successful schools today they would no doubt be gratified to find that so much is now being done in them for industrial needs.[578]

In one sense it was never going to be difficult to see an improvement in the industrial aspects of art school training. In schools that had for so long had been following Cole and Redgrave's National Course of Instruction which was based around drawing ability and which didn't allow any practical work to be undertaken, any concerted efforts to introduce modelling or a craft class to the curriculum would be a development; possibly some of those on the Select Committee of 1837 would, if they could see the situation in 1946, think that great improvements had been made.

From the language used in the two reports it seems that the SIA and the Ministry of Education were approaching the same issue – the training of designers for industry – from two different directions. The SIA believed that purpose of art schools was to provide technical and industrial experience, and planning and draughtsmanship skills, while the Ministry of Education was suggesting that art schools were for training designers who could bring artistic knowledge to industry. The Ministry of Education, it seems, were following the view of their predecessors the Board of Trade, Department of Science and Art and Board of Education in viewing art school training as for the purpose of applying art and artistic ability to manufactures, whereas the SIA realised that given the technological changes occurring within manufacturing, students would need more technical training than had previously been provided.

As well as the SIA and the Ministry of Education making more general recommendations regarding the training of students in art schools, specific to furniture was the 1946 Board of Trade *Working Party Report* on the furniture industry which, as

[578] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

well as being an overview of the state of the furniture industry in the 1930s and 40s, also made recommendations as to the training furniture designers would need.
As noted in the previous chapter, the number of full-time designers in the furniture industry had historically been small, and the *Working Party Report* recognised this, noting that the majority of furniture firms did not employ a full-time designer, and those that did were mainly the large firms.[579] In other smaller firms, 'designs are the responsibility of people with other functions in the factory – the proprietors themselves, the works managers and so on, while in some case draftsmen are employed to translate their ideas into drawings', but the trouble was that very few of these people had received any kind of training in design.[580] It was the failure of many firms to use the services of such a trained designer which had accounted, thought the authors of the report, for 'the low standard of design which prevailed in the industry before the war'.[581] There was, suggested the authors of the *Working Party Report,* 'such a thing as a standard of good design' within furniture, which should be concerned with:

> form, colour, decoration, texture, fitness for its job, method of production, method of transport and saleability. It is not something applied at the end, nor is it something different for the sake of being different.[582]

In a similar vein to the SIA report, the *Working Party Report* noted that technical instruction in the art schools was 'related almost entirely to handcraftsmanship and…there is little or no equipment for training in machine methods', and certain art schools were noted as being averse to installing such equipment.[583] Birmingham's art school had introduced craft classes towards the end of the nineteenth century, and it seems that those at the school were loath to install machinery to the art school because the principals of the school 'believe that handcraftsmanship provides the best basic training and that instruction in machine methods can be best given in the factory'.[584] The authors of the *Working Party Report* found that across art schools there was no training in machine production available in the courses designed for the furniture

---

[579] Board of Trade *Working Party Report: Furniture* (London, 1946) p 113.
[580] *Ibid.*, p. 113.
[581] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[582] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[583] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[584] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

trade.[585] The problem was that: 'a rigid barrier appears to have grown up between furniture-making on the one hand, which is regarded by the authorities as a handcraft and taught accordingly, and machine production in wood on the other hand, which is regarded by them as the province of the carpentry and joinery trades, and that as a result no proper training facilities exist at present for the large section of the furniture industry which is now operating on a semi-mechanised basis'.[586]

The report went on to state that 'education for the furniture industry has completely failed to keep pace with the growth of the industry and with changes in its production techniques', which was also the observation of the SIA report.[587] The result of this was that 'employers have often found that boys drawn from these schools have to be trained all over again in the factory before they can play a useful part in production…', while those who attended art schools in the evenings found that the content of the classes bore little relation to the work they did during the day. [588]

The *Working Party Report* recommended that a review of the existing provision for training in art schools be undertaken in order to ensure several conditions could be met: that enough places were available to cater for the needs of the furniture industry; that facilities for handcraft and machine training should be brought together so that students could get a comprehensive training; that better equipment be provided in schools, including modern machinery, and that local trade advisory committees were comprised of a more representative selection of members.[589] If these conditions were met, the *Working Party Report* concluded that it would provide as complete a training as possible for students wishing to enter the furniture trade, though the authors of the report did note that for those who were to assume positions of leadership in industry – whether in management, design, or production – the art school education would not be fully comprehensive, and students would still require some form of advanced

[585] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[586] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[587] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[588] *Ibid.*, p. 123.
[589] *Ibid.*, p. 123-4.

training.[590] The authors of the *Working Party Report* were clear that more needed to be done in art schools to aid the training of designers for the furniture industry; experience of machine methods was required now that mechanisation was increasingly part of furniture making. Changes had been occurring in the furniture industry and now art schools had to respond to those changes if the training they offered was to be relevant and useful for students.

5.4 Utility Furniture

One war-time development which was of importance to the furniture industry was the Utility Furniture scheme which was introduced by the Board of Trade in 1942 to ensure that enough furniture was produced to replace that which had been destroyed by bombing raids, and also provide furniture for newly-married couples setting up home. The second-hand market provided some of this furniture, and indeed, prices for second-hand furniture increased, but some new furniture still had to be produced.[591] Timber shortages and price controls during the war years had limited furniture manufacture, and furniture firms had been encouraged to undertake work for local authorities, hospitals and the forces. The question was how to control who could purchase furniture during the war, but more importantly, who could make it. Timber was in short supply and there was the concern that manufacturers would make bad quality furniture and sell it at high prices to people who needed furniture whatever the cost.[592] The solution was a standard design which would make the best use of raw materials but which was also high quality. As the *CC41* book notes, the Utility scheme for furniture was 'an unparalleled example of the total state control not only of the supply but more importantly, the design of an essential commodity'.[593] As Sparke also notes, the scheme

> also determined what kind of furniture should be manufactured, for what price and by whom. This was the first time that a government body had been vested

[590] *Ibid.*, p. 124.
[591] J. Vaizey *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951* (London: 1995) p. 5.
Ibid., p. 5.
[593] *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951* (London: 1995) p. 7.

> with enough authority to make sure that only the furniture it thought best for people was actually produced.[594]

Similarly, Attfield also recognises that the furniture industry at this time was: 'the only sector of industry to be subjected to design by dictate as part of the programme of rationalisation introduced during the war, not only to deal with immediate problems thrown up by the state of emergency, but also to promote a design reform agenda of longer-term planned modernisation'.[595]

'Standard Emergency Furniture' had been introduced in 1941 due to the extreme timber shortages, but this furniture was very basic and was made by firms already contracted to produce canteen, office and hospital furniture.[596] An advisory committee for Utility furniture was set up in 1942 after the timber quota allowed to firms was cut by one third and plywood was withdrawn from the quota as it was required for aircraft construction, and in 1943 the Design Panel was formed, chaired by the furniture designer Gordon Russell.[597] The first pieces of furniture produced under the Utility scheme were done so by firms selected by the Board of Trade, and included in the first catalogue were a dining table and chairs, fireside chair, sideboard, kitchen cabinets, and a bedroom suite (bed, wardrobe, tallboy and dressing table).[598] The range of furniture available was expanded as time went on: in 1945 all-metal bedsteads were included, and in 1946 other new ranges of furniture were introduced.[599]

The furniture produced under the scheme had, according to Sparke, to 'conform to the highest possible tenets of quality and taste – according to the criteria of those in authority'.[600] And those in authority had, through the Utility scheme, free reign to impose their ideas of 'good design' on the British public. Sparke notes that there was a feeling that 'good taste' had at last replaced much of the 'tastelessness' prevalent in

---

[594] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 73.
[595] Attfield, J ''Give 'em something dark and heavy': The Role of Design in the material Culture of Popular British Furniture, 1939-1965' *Journal of Design History* Vol. 9 no. 3, 1996, pp. 185-201. http://jdh.oxfordjournals.org/
[596] *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951* (London: 1995) p. 9.
[597] *Ibid.*, p. 10 & P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p.74.
[598] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 74.
[599] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[600] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

popular furniture.[601] Rather in the way that Cole and Redgrave, in the late 1800s, had decided that art education could be standardised, and good design could be quantified and taught in stages, so those involved in the Utility scheme also thought that good design could be represented in standardised pieces of furniture. The furniture trade was initially opposed to any form of control over its activities, but by 1942 when the Utility Furniture Advisory Committee was formed, the trade journal *Cabinet Maker* stated that:

> Our guess is, and our hope is, that the Committee will plump for sound, plain and functionally satisfactory furniture. If it does so, it will have left, after the war, a solid and nationally characteristic mark upon style.[602]

This comment suggests that the furniture trade was perhaps no longer as opposed to the Utility Scheme as they had been, and reactions to the first pieces of furniture proposed under the scheme were apparently favourable.[603] Although one of the benefits of the scheme was that it was a chance to educate the public regarding good design via the furniture they bought through the scheme, this was not as successful as it was perhaps expected to be. One comment regarding the Utility furniture was that it was 'Good, solid, sensible…that's just what the public doesn't like'.[604] Similarly Edwards argues that though Utility furniture was seen as exemplifying good design, the scheme was perhaps not as influential as it first appears:

> Hailed by some as the great opportunity to once and for all change the course of furniture design, by others as a bureaucratic interference in an industry quite capable of looking after itself, and received with ambivalence by the customers it was designed for, it is little wonder that it did not survive much beyond the emergency period. The furniture produced under the scheme was ultimately the response to a peculiar situation and could not be expected to act as a catalyst for major changes in attitudes to furnishing.[605]

Attfield also argues that the attempt to standardise design was not realised through the Utility scheme:

> There was disagreement among the various factions of the Good Design movement who did not agree over production methods, ideal materials or

---

[601] *Ibid.,* p. 75.
[602] Cited in *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951* (London: 1995) p. 28.
[603] *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951* (London: 1995) p 28.
[604] Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[605] C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, Manufacture and Markets* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994) p. 183. Among those who cited utility furniture as being of good taste and design were Kenneth Holmes ('The Linking of Technical and Art Education' in *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* vol. 98, No. 4818 (7 April, 1950) pp. 432-446).

> aesthetics. In spite of lip service to 'mass production' and an ideal reflected in an aesthetic, standardisation of production or modularity of design was not achieved.[606]

In 1948 the Utility scheme ended, following the end of rationing, though many manufacturers continued to produce Board of Trade approved Utility furniture until 1952, as this wasn't subject to tax, unlike non-Utility furniture.[607] Both Sparke and Edwards note that as soon as the Utility scheme ended, the public went back to purchasing the type of furniture it preferred: and this was not utility-style furniture.[608] What they did want, Sparke suggests, was 'more novelty, decoration, variation', and there was a 'stylistic free for all' now that the control exerted by the Utility scheme had ended.[609]. Farr also noted that Utility Furniture, rather than having the effect of persuading people that the clean lines and simpler designs of modern furniture were an improvement on the antique reproduction styles present before the war, was perhaps too stark and modern for the public, and they returned to pre-war styles once the Utility scheme ended.[610] While those behind the Utility furniture may have seen the scheme as a chance to promote good design in furniture, the public were not enamoured with the simpler designs and lack of ornament of Utility furniture. War-time production methods began to be introduced to the furniture industry, and it was these that would have more of an impact on the training of students at art schools than the war-time designs of the furniture itself.

5.5 Art exams are overhauled

The various recommendations of the *Working Party Report*, the *Art Education* pamphlet and the *Memorandum on the Education and Status of the Designer in Industry* were all well-intentioned, but the Ministry of Education had already decided to overhaul the

---

606 J. Attfield *The Role of Design in the Relationship between Furniture Manufacture and its Retailing 1939-1965, with initial reference to the furniture firm of J. Clarke* (University of Brighton, unpublished PhD thesis, 1992) p. 491.
607 P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 74.
608 *Ibid.*, p. 74 & C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, Manufacture and Markets* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994) p. 183-4.
609 P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) .p 75 & 81.
610 M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 5-6.

existing art examination system and in 1946 introduced the National Diploma in Design. Until 1913, students at art schools followed Cole and Redgrave's 23-stage National Course of Instruction, with examinations after each stage; stages were also grouped for the purposes of awarding either an Art Class Teacher's Certificate or an Art Master's Certificate, depending on what the students wished to study.[611] This system was replaced in 1913 with a Drawing Examination, taken after two years full-time study in an art school, followed by second-stage examinations in Industrial Design, Illustration, Painting or Modelling.[612] The Drawing Examination consisted of tests in six subjects: Drawing from Life, Drawing and Painting from Memory and Knowledge, Anatomy, Architecture, Drawing from the Cast and Perspective.[613] After completing the Drawing Examination students could take one or more of these second stage-exams as they wanted. The exam for Industrial Design was in two parts: the first consisted of tests in botanical drawing and a general knowledge of design, while the second 'comprised tests in design (from a range of industrial crafts), methods of production and styles of design'.[614] Students usually spent about two years full-time studying for each stage, though it was also possible to take the exams after part-time study.[615] Therefore a full-time student wishing to do the Drawing Examination followed by a certificate in Industrial Design would have to spend four years at art school. Students wishing to become art teachers would also take a pedagogy certificate, initially called the Teaching Certificate for Teachers in Schools of Art and changed, in 1933, to the Art Teacher's Diploma. [616]

In 1946 the Ministry of Education reorganised the examination system and the Drawing Examination was replaced by an Intermediate Certificate in Arts and Crafts, which, like its predecessor, followed a fairly wide field of study, and consisted of Drawing from Life, Drawing and Painting from Memory and Knowledge, Anatomy and Architecture, Costume Drawing, Creative Design for a Craft, Modelling, Painting from Still Life,

---

611 Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 7.
612 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
613 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
614 R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p 4.
615 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
616 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Perspective, Plant Drawing and General Knowledge.[617] The four certificates that had been available as second-stage examinations were reorganised and renamed as the National Diploma in Design (NDD) and students could either concentrate on a single subject or take two subjects. Students taking one subject chose from 'List A', which included Furniture, Illustration and Pottery, while those taking two subjects had to choose from 'List B', which included Book-Binding, Letter Cutting, Stained Glass, and Wood Carving.[618] There was a large range of options available to students, which according to Ashwin, resulted in NDD subjects becoming known as 'the 57 varieties'.[619] The introduction of the NDD marked the first real attempts to give students a more industrially relevant training and to introduce more practical work than had previously been the case on art school courses. While some of the courses available for study for the NDD were still crafts based; Wood Carving, Embroidery and Tapestry Weaving, for example, other courses such as Cast Iron work, Lead work, Die Sinking, or Shoe Design were more industrially focussed, reflecting the beginnings of a change in focus of art schools and a recognition that industrial and technical processes were changing and therefore art school education had also to change in order to be relevant to industry.

The intention was that all students would undertake the Intermediate Certificate in Arts and Crafts before going on to the National Diploma in Design. The 1948 *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* states that the intention was to ensure a broad foundation at the Intermediate level and a uniformly high standard at the National

---

[617] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) pp. 7-8 & 24.
[618] *Ibid.*, p. 22-3.
[619] C. Ashwin *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 84.
In 1946-7 NDD List A subjects were: Dress; Furniture; Glass Making and Decorating; Gold and Silver Smithing; Illustration; Interior Decoration; Modelling and Sculpture; Painting; Painting and Decorating; Pottery; Printed Textiles (Hand and Machine); Woven Textiles (Hand and Machine); Knitwear; Lace. List B courses were: Book-Binding; Die-Sinking; Embroidery (Hand); Embroidery (Machine); Enamelling; Engraving on Metal; Inlay; Marquetry and Veneer; Jewellery; Letter Cutting; Writing and Illuminating; Light Metal Work; Lithography; Mosaic Work; Printed Textiles (Hand); Printed Textiles (Machine); Process Reproduction; Stained Glass; Terra Cotta Work; Typography; Wallpaper Design; Wood Carving; Woven Textiles (Hand); Woven Textiles (Machine); Carpet Weaving; Cast Iron Work; Fabric Knitting; Gesso Work; Lace (Machine); Lacquer Work; Lead Work; Leather Work; Linoleum; Plaster Work; Rug Weaving (Hand); Shoe Design; Shop Display; Stone Carving; Tapestry Weaving (Hand); Wrought Iron Work. C. Ashwin *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 84.

Diploma level'.[620] The NDD was criticised on the grounds that narrow specialisation led to limited job opportunities, that the academic standing of the courses was low, and that centrally administered examinations forced colleges into a common mould.[621] While this may have been the case, it could be argued that the NDD was the first attempt by the Ministry of Education to ensure that all art schools gave their students practical and more vocational training than they had done previously, and all to the same standard. Some art schools such as Birmingham and Leicester had previously started to develop their own courses and introduce practical work relevant to the jobs their students would be doing; whilst a creative move, by 1946 the Ministry of Education may have felt the need to standardise education so that whichever art school a student attended, the education would be of a similar standard. Cole and Redgrave had standardised art and design education in the latter half of the nineteenth century – a move which had been detrimental to the development of design education as it essentially ended practical classes in art schools and removed from students the chance to make their designs or have any experience of handling and working with the materials for which they were designing. There had been the issue that art schools were supposedly for advanced work, but it was quickly discovered that the majority of students did not possess even basic drawing skills. It was this problem that Cole and Redgrave's standardised system set out to remedy, thus standardising downwards to the lowest common denominator: drawing ability. However the NDD, it can be argued, was an attempt to standardise upwards by re-introducing the practical work that had been lacking for so long in art schools. The 1977 Carter report noted that the NDD 'broke the subject down into highly specialised areas with the object of providing in depth training in vocational skills to a national examination standard': this was a positive development bearing in mind that previously, any practical work undertaken in art schools seems to have been largely on the initiative of the head masters of the individual art schools rather than any national policy.[622] It is also interesting to note that the change of name in the examinations had much more of an emphasis on design – it was the National Diploma in Design, not the National Diploma in Art and Design, perhaps a recognition that courses needed to be more vocational and practical after such a long emphasis on

[620] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 8.
[621] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 11.
[622] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 11.

drawing and painting. Strand comments that the change in examinations to the Intermediate Certificate and the National Diploma in Design was probably intended to raise the status of the exams, and 'as the title of the new Diploma implied, to direct more attention to the teaching of design'.[623] This is exactly what the authors of *Design and the Designer in Industry*, the Hambleden report, *Art Education*, the SIA's *Memorandum on the Education and Status of the Designer in Industry* and the *Working Party Report; Furniture* had called for.

Although there was a wide range of subjects open to students who went on to take the NDD, not all of the options were taken up by students. Some subjects, such as Painting and Illustration, attracted over 100 students each in 1946-7, while in the same year, 42 of the 55 subjects on offer attracted fewer than five students, which suggests that the subjects offered were perhaps too specialised.[624] While the Intermediate Certificate was fairly prescribed in terms of what was studied for the examination, the NDD was not, and thus art schools were able to put forward their own schemes for NDD courses, which were then approved by the Ministry of Education.[625] This would have enabled art schools to put on courses that were more relevant to local industries than was previously the case, but did also lead to a wide range of often very specialised courses, a situation which was criticised, as noted above.

As well as the criticism that the subjects on offer were too specialised, Ashwin notes that the Intermediate / NDD system proved to be 'very rigorous' with a high failure rate, and the tests imposed were complex and specific.[626] Figures provided in the *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* in 1948 bear this out, especially when compared to pass rates under the old system of examinations:

---

[623] R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 5.
[624] C. Ashwin *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 84.
[625] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 26.
[626] C. Ashwin *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London, 1975) p. 84.

Art and design examination pass rates

	1937	1938	1939
Drawing examination	68%	59%	53%
Industrial design exam	65%	55%	50% [627]

	1946	1947
Intermediate certificate	64%	57%
List A subjects	49%	43%
List B subjects	44%	49% [628]

As can be seen above, while there is little difference in the pass rates for the Drawing Examination and Intermediate Certificate, there is a noticeable difference in the rates for the Industrial Design Exam and the NDD list A and B subjects. It is worth noting though, that numbers of students in the post-war period had increased, so more students were entering art and design education than previously, though pass rates for the NDD of less than half were not particularly good. Specifically regarding the NDD in Furniture, in 1946 seven students took the exam with three passing (pass rate of 43%), and in 1947, four students took the exam, with two passes (pass rate of 50%).[629]
With both the Intermediate Certificate and NDD, 30% of the mark was awarded internally by the College or art school based on a student's work throughout the course, and 70% was based on the final examination, which was assessed nationally. For both qualifications, the pass mark was 40%.[630]

[627] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 20-1.
[628] *Ibid.*, p. 21-3.
[629] *Ibid.*, p. 22. Strangely, the *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* does not give any indication as to how there are pass rates available for 1946, when the new system was introduced in that same year. Both the Intermediate Certificate and NDD each took two years to complete, so logic would suggest that the first pass rates would be available in 1948. It may well be that students already studying for the Drawing Certificate and Industrial Design Certificate were made to take the new Intermediate and NDD exams in 1946, which could account for the low pass rates, but this is not clear from the Bray report.
[630] *Ibid.*, p. 25 & 27.

5.6 The National Diploma in Design at Leicester and Birmingham

Due to the lack of prospectuses available in the archive which cover the war years at Leicester art school, it is not clear in which year the NDD was introduced, but the first prospectus available in the post war years (the 1947-48 session), states that 'Courses for the Ministry of Education National Diploma in Design…are also included'.[631] The School of Industrial Design brochure for 1947-8 states that List A courses available for the NDD were: dress; gold and silversmithing; illustration; interior decoration; painting; decorating and sign writing; knitwear; modelling and sculpture; pottery, and printed textiles.[632] List B courses available were: bookbinding; embroidery; fabric knitting; jewellery; lead work; lettering; writing and illuminating; letter cutting; lithography; plaster work; process reproduction; rug weaving; shoe design; stone carving; terra cotta work; typography, and woven textiles.[633] Furniture was not offered as an NDD subject at Leicester at this time, though the prospectus for 1947-8 states that 'Full and part time courses in Design and Craftsmanship are provided by the departments of Cabinet Making and Upholstery…', and the School of Industrial Design also offered full and part-time courses 'for students who wish to enter any branch of the Furnishing trade'.[634] Classes included drawing, geometry, design and history of furniture, theory and practical work in cabinet making and all branches of upholstery, and interior decoration, and the three year course qualified students to take the final City and Guilds of London Institute examinations.[635] Courses for apprentices were still offered, running on one full day and two evenings per week. By the following academic year, 1948-49, Leicester's art school had dropped several courses from its NDD choices: modelling, jewellery, plaster-work, lead-work and terra cotta work had all ended, and the distinction between List A and List B courses had also gone; students could choose from 'one or more' courses instead.[636]

---

631 *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1947-48* p. 10.
632 *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1947-48 School of Industrial Design* (Separate brochure) p. 1.
633 *Ibid.*, p. 2.
634 *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1947-48* p. 10 & *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1947-48 School of Industrial Design* (Separate brochure) p. 4.
635 *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1947-48 School of Industrial Design* (Separate brochure) p 4.
636 *Leicester College of Art Prospectus 1948-49* p. 10.

The production of Birmingham art school's abridged war-time prospectuses continued until the 1950-1 session; the first full prospectus after the war was the one for 1951-2 and this stated that courses were held 'for students who wish to take the Ministry of Education National Diploma in Design in Furniture and Allied Crafts' in addition to courses for 'designers and other full-time students'.[637] In the School of Furniture, junior and senior apprentices, journeymen, designers and other full-time students were all catered for with various course and classes.[638] For students wishing to take the City and Guilds of London examinations in Cabinet Making, 'special instruction to cover the syllabus for this examination' was available.[639]

The prospectuses of both Birmingham and Leicester art schools reveal a change of language regarding design in the post war years. Leicester's prospectus for 1947 is the first in which this change is seen – courses in 1936 are for those wishing to become artists and craftsmen; in 1947 this has changed to courses for students who wish to become 'designers and craftsmen for industry...'.[640] This change in wording from 'artists' to 'designers' and the addition of 'for industry' reflects the change in emphasis of the Leicester College towards a more industry-oriented outlook. Birmingham's prospectuses reflect a similar change; in 1936 the art school offered courses 'for those intending to enter one of the artistic professions and for craftsmen, teachers and others' and by 1951 courses were for 'those intending to enter one of the artistic professions and for industrial designers, craftsmen, teachers and others'; the addition of 'industrial designers' perhaps reflecting a recognition that industrial design training was becoming more important.[641]

---

637 *College of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham Prospectus 1951-1952* p. 24.
638 *Ibid.*, p. 24.
639 *Ibid.*, p. 24.
640 *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus: Session 1947-48* p. 10.
641 *Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham 1936-7* p. 14 & *College of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham: Prospectus 1951-52* p. 12.

5.7 Reviewing the system

Almost as soon as it had been introduced, the government decided to review the Intermediate Certificate and NDD and in 1947 appointed a committee to do this. Included on the committee were Kenneth Holmes, Principal of Leicester College of Art, Gordon Russell the furniture designer, and EMO'R Dickey, author of the 1934 report *Industry and Art Education on the Continent.* The *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations,* known as the Bray report after the Chairman F. Bray, was published in 1948.[642] The aim of the Committee was to review art examinations and see if a system could be introduced whereby art schools would conduct more of their own internal examinations with some external assessment, rather than the Ministry of Education having to assess 70% of the marks for a course. In addition, as art and design education had been under government control for so long and had almost become separate from the rest of the education system, the Ministry of Education wished to remedy this by giving art schools greater autonomy and by trying to bring technical, commercial and art and design education together so that resources and teaching could be shared. They also wished to consider the on-going issue of art teacher training, which had been separate from other teacher training for so long, being conducted in art schools rather than in colleges of education.

The committee considered that students who took the Ministry's examinations went into one of two main professions: teaching or designing for industry, and the report concerned itself with full-time students who were intending to enter one of these two fields. Regarding training for these students, the committee asked the following questions:

> Should they all follow the same course, or if there is a need for differentiation, at what stage should this begin? How far do the present courses meet their requirements?[643]

[642] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948). Dickey's full name was Edward Montgomery O'Rorke Dickey.
[643] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 10.

The committee recommended that both groups continue to undertake the Intermediate Examination, as this would provide a 'broad course of basic training'; in addition it would serve as a qualifying exam for the NDD and indicate a measure of basic skills.[644] Subjects to be studied for the Intermediate Certificate were Life Drawing (nude), Drawing and Painting from Memory and Knowledge, Modelling and Creative Design for a Craft and Still-Life Painting.[645] Part-time students already working in industry would still be catered for in art schools, and would be encouraged to undertake NDD examinations, though without having to take the Intermediate Certificate first. Following the Intermediate Certificate, students went on to take one 'List A' subject or two 'List B' subjects for the National Diploma in Design. It was at this point, the Bray report recommended, that courses for intending teachers and designers for industry and those already working in industry should be slightly different. For those intending to be teachers in art schools or in general education 'post Intermediate courses…should always be broad enough to enable the students to undertake effectively the teaching of art and crafts in schools of general education'.[646] For students already employed in industry or intending to design for industry, however, course content should be closely linked to the requirements of their employment.[647] It was noted by the Bray report that the NDD was not recognised by industry as a qualification with value, and they believed that it was 'highly desirable to devise courses and qualifications which will act as passports to industry and commerce much more effectively than does the present National Diploma'.[648] The report did not recommend ending the NDD and replacing it with anything more industry-focussed though; at present it was satisfied with keeping the NDD qualification but giving art schools more freedom to design their own courses as they saw fit, which meant they could tailor courses to students needs and to the needs of the localities in which they were based.[649]

Like the *Design and the Designer in Industry* report, the Committee on Art Examinations felt that for full-time students industrial experience was necessary after

[644] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[645] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[646] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[647] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[648] *Ibid.*, p. 11-12.
[649] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

art school training, and that it was not for art schools to produce a designers who were able to be productive immediately upon entering industry; they would need a period in which to learn the processes of the business in which they were employed.[650] The Committee's recommendation for courses for designers for industry was that after the Intermediate Certificate art schools should provide a 'further more specialised full-time course of two years, preferably including some industrial or commercial experience, or its equivalent in part-time study'.[651] The Bray report recommended that students' training to be linked to the employment they were likely to enter, and advocated more freedom for art schools to set their own curricula in order to bring this about.[652] This was perhaps the first recognition that standardised examinations set by an overseeing body (the Ministry of Education) could be too formulaic, and that a 'one size fits all' policy was not in the best interests of the students or of the industries they were entering. Art school courses and examinations had been set and controlled by the government and then the Board and later Ministry of Education since 1837; finally, over a hundred years later, things were beginning to change. The Bray Committee recommended that 'the schools should draw up their own courses of study, on which examinations should be based, and that art school teachers should participate directly in the examination of their students'.[653] This would be the start of art schools being given more flexibility in designing courses which would better suit their students' needs and the needs of local industries. The distinction between 'List A' and 'List B' courses was to be dropped and there would be only one examination for the award, though students could still take two subjects if they wished.[654]

Following the recommendations laid out in the *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (the Bray report), the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations (NACAE) was set up in 1949 to oversee changes to the NDD. Ten years later, in 1959, it was replaced by the National Advisory Council on Art Education – also known as the NACAE. To avoid confusion throughout this thesis, the National Advisory Committee

650 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
651 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
652 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
653 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
654 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

on Art Examinations will be shortened to the NACAEx, and the National Advisory Council on Art Education to the NACAEd.

Modifications to Intermediate / NDD examinations were introduced in 1951, following the recommendations in the Bray report and the work of the NACAEx. The number of subjects in the Intermediate Certificate was reduced to four, with students now only examined in drawing from life, pictorial composition, modelling, and creative design for a craft.[655] The distinction between List A and List B subjects for the NDD had also been ended; instead, if a student only took one subject for the NDD exam, this was known as a 'special' subject; if they did two subjects, they were known as 'main' and 'additional' subjects.[656] Changes in assessment had also been made following the Bray report's recommendations; instead of examinations being conducted entirely by external examiners, the staff of the various art schools examined students' work initially, and then assessors from the Ministry of Education would come in and assess and agree marks.[657] It is not clear whether courses put on in art schools still had to be approved by the Ministry of Education, though as changes made were in the area of assessment rather than course design, it is likely that approval by the Ministry was still required before an art school could run a course.

5.8 Re-organisation of the RCA

While the Ministry of Education was overhauling the examination system and introducing the Intermediate Certificate and NDD, the place of the RCA within the system of art and design education was also being considered. Percy Jowett, then Principal of the RCA, was due to retire in the summer of 1947 and it was felt that this would provide an opportunity for the College to be re-organised. Additionally, the introduction of the NDD and the designation of the RCA as a College of post-NDD 'advanced work' also raised questions regarding its place in the wider system of art and

655 R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 5.
656 *Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design 1955-56* (Separate prospectus) p. 3.
657 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1964) para. 1.

design education. The issue of the RCA had been raised before both the First and Second World Wars, but had not been resolved satisfactorily; as Robin Darwin noted: 'If the College was still run on much the same lines that it had been running on for more than a century, if it had survived a greater number of committees of inquiry than almost any other institution in the country, if it still obtained all and more than all the students which it needed, and from a few at least secured some very good results, there was no urgent need to change'.[658]

However it now seemed the need had become more urgent, and early in 1947 a meeting was held regarding the situation. Cunliffe-Charlesworth notes that all those present at the meeting agreed that the College supplied 'more than enough' students for the needs of industry (though on what basis this was agreed is not known) and the remainder of students were going into teaching.[659] It was suggested that the RCA be divided into four departments of design: Pictorial Design, Domestic Interior Design (to include Furniture), Dress Design, and Engineering Design.[660] The Council of Industrial Design (CoID) wanted to get rid of Fine Art training at the College, arguing that there were plenty of other institutions in London (such as the Slade School) for students wishing to become painters, though they did think that as drawing was necessary to design subjects, some facility for fine art should remain at the College.[661]

Robin Darwin was appointed Principal after Percy Jowett retired; his first day at the RCA was January 1, 1948, and by his own account, what he found when he walked around the College was not altogether inspiring:

> it was a shock to find stamped on the drawing desks the date 1870, to find Morrison shelters doing duty for printing tables in the Textile Department, to find only one sewing machine in the Dress Section and much of the weaving equipment dating from the early nineteenth century…There were no drawing

[658] R. Darwin 'The Dodo and the Phoenix: The Royal College of Art since the War' *Royal Society of Arts, Journal* 102:4918 (1954: Feb5) pp. 174-188.
[659] H. Cunliffe-Charlesworth *The Royal College of Art: Its Influence on Education, Art and Design 1900-1950* (Sheffield City Polytechnic: unpublished PhD thesis, 1991) p. 237.
[660] *Ibid.*, p. 237-8.
[661] *Ibid.*, p. 237-8.

> offices anywhere in the College, and only two studios for the whole School of Design; nor was there a lecture theatre.[662]

Between 1945-46 Darwin had worked as Training Officer at the Council of Industrial Design, and had written a *Report on the Training of the Industrial Designer*, which was based on the findings of the Hambleden Committee: Darwin was keen to see some of the views expressed in his report put into practice at the RCA.[663] Darwin's report stated, as Hambleden and *Design and the Designer in Industry* before it had stated, that:

> Many of the art schools… have become somewhat remote from reality and… have tended to concentrate too exclusively upon handcraft subjects and upon the fine arts. In these circumstances a number of industrialists tend to look askance at them…[664]

Frayling, writing in 1987, commented wryly that; 'All this had been said (and ignored) many times before, by assorted government agencies for at least a hundred years', and went on to note that 'Where the Royal College of Art was concerned, it was argued that when you raise the summit of the art education system, you raise the system with it: and, since the local schools were expected to provide a 'broad training', the Royal College should specialise much more effectively than it had ever been able to do before'.[665]

Darwin was evidently of this view as well, and considered that the most important change he could make to the College was 'a policy of rigid specialization in all fields of design, to discard responsibility towards the teaching profession and to provide courses of a thoroughly professional nature in all primary industrial fields'.[666] This view fitted the RCA into the overall scheme of art education now in place with the Intermediate Certificate and NDD. Students started with a broad education at Intermediate level, before progressing to more specialised work at NDD level, with further specialisation for any students who progressed on to the RCA.

---

[662] R. Darwin 'The Dodo and the Phoenix: The Royal College of Art since the War' *Royal Society of Arts, Journal* 102:4918 (1954: Feb5) pp. 174-188.
[663] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) pp. 131 & 132.
[664] Cited in *Ibid.*, p. 130.
[665] Cited in C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) pp. 131 & 130.
[666] R. Darwin in *The Times Educational Supplement*, 10 November 1967, cited in S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970) p. 358.

The view that if standards at the institution at the top are raised – the RCA in this case – then the rest of the system will follow, had been stated in the 1830s but had been used by Joshua Reynolds against the idea of founding a school of design. Reynolds' opinion was that if standards of fine art (at the Royal Academy) were raised, then a school of design was not necessary as there would be a 'trickle down' effect through the rest of the population. It is interesting to see how, one hundred or so years later, the same thought was now being expressed about the Royal College; that it should now be the source of the 'trickle down' effect; that if standards at the RCA were improved this would also have a effect lower down in the regional art schools and standards within those schools would also rise as students aspired to enter the RCA.

Under Darwin the administration of the College was taken from the Ministry of Education and overseen by a College Council instead, which then set up seven *ad hoc* committees comprised of experts from the Ministry of Education, designers, and industrialists, who were to report on the numbers of students who should be trained in the various fields of design, the nature of that training, and the equipment required.[667] The result was that the existing School of Design within the College was abolished, and six new Schools were set up for the following subjects: Ceramics; Fashion Design; Typography and Design for Publicity (renamed Graphic Design); Silversmithing and Jewellery (including Industrial Glass); Textile Design; Light Engineering and Furniture (later renamed Wood, Metals and Plastics).[668] The intention was that each School should provide a 'specialised and professional training with a view to direct assistance to industry', so a practising designer was appointed Professor of each school, specialist teachers from industry were recruited, and new equipment provided for each school.[669] Frayling comments that the policy behind the reorganisation was one of specialisation in training, a policy which was contrary to the concept of 'general design principles'

---

[667] *Royal College of Art Calendar and Prospectus 1949-50* p. 28. & M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 181.
[668] *Royal College of Art Calendar and Prospectus 1949-50* p. 29. & C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 134.
[669] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 181.

expressed by witnesses to the 1835 Select Committee.[670] However, in 1835, there were no schools of design in existence in the country, and the subsequent Normal School of Design, founded in 1837 would have had to teach general design principles, as it was the only design school. As the system of art and design education expanded and art and design began to be taught as part of compulsory education as well as in art schools and at the RCA, there was more scope for the RCA, as the institution at the top of the system, to be the most specialised. The local and regional art schools were providing training in general design principles, via the Intermediate Certificate and NDD, so Frayling's comment is slightly misjudged given that he was citing a time when there were no schools of art in existence, compared to 1948, when there was a large system of art and design teaching in place. Indeed it would have been odd if the RCA were still teaching the general principles of design in 1948, when there were so many other schools and art schools doing the same.

In the nineteenth century there had been some, such as George Foggo, who expressed the view that, as in fine art, there were certain undeniable principles of design which, once taught to the student, could then be applied in an branch of manufacture; this is the view which had been held by Cole and Redgrave and which resulted in their 23-stage National Course of Instruction.[671] Darwin, however, took the opposite line, stating that:

> Only in a fairly narrow and concentrated field will a students' interests be sufficiently aroused to evoke his deeper creative instincts…It is far better to learn through one subject the values which will be found later on to apply to many others,

and this was the policy he pursued at the RCA.[672] The aim of the RCA's reorganisation was to bring into effect specialised training for industrial purposes, and as Frayling comments, in the immediate post-war years, 'the full weight of the College, Council, and Council of Industrial Design was put behind the provision of specialized and

---

[670] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 134.
[671] See the evidence from George Foggo and the statement of the Committee on Arts and Manufactures in chapter two.
[672] R. Darwin 'The Training of the Industrial Designer' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 97:4794 (1949: May 6) pp. 421-436.

professional instruction in all branches of industrial design with a direct bearing on the national economy'.[673]

The intention was, then, that the RCA would offer a specialised training for the benefit of industry, and that seems to have been implemented quickly. The 1950-51 prospectus for the Faculty of Industrial Design, School of Wood, Metals and Plastics notes that:

> The aim of the School is to train designers who will be capable of designing in close co-operation with the technicians and executives upon whom modern factory production depends. The School does not attempt to train craftsmen or technicians, but it is constantly stressed in the designers' training that design must be related to, and intimately allied with, production technique.[674]

The prospectus then gives a list of the machinery available in the School, going on to state that 'This machinery is used for demonstrating fundamental processes in manufacture and for making models, mockups and prototypes designed in the School…'[675] There was obviously much more practical work being undertaken at the RCA and Darwin seems to have succeeded in his efforts to purchase more machinery for the College in order to give students an understanding of some of the technical processes.

The full-time course leading to the RCA's diploma consisted of three years at the College followed by nine months in a factory to gain industrial experience.[676] This meant that if students had come from an art school, having completed the Intermediate and NDD qualifications, and then gone on and done the RCA's course, they would have spent a total seven years at art school followed by nine months in industry. The first year of the RCA course was described as 'intended to develop the cultural foundation essential for specialised training in design', while the second year was focussed on 'the more technical aspect of designing for production'.[677] During the final year of the course 'all previous teaching is applied to more ambitious and more individual

---

[673] C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 135.
[674] *Royal College of Art Prospectus 1950-51* p. 77.
[675] *Ibid.*, p. 77-8.
[676] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[677] *Ibid.*, p. 78-9.

designing exercises, the student specialising in one particular field of design…'.[678] Emphasis in the first year was on draughtsmanship – 'measured, mechanical, perspective, freehand and some life drawing' – and on general presentation, with some introductory lectures to prepare students for the second year.[679] In the second year students did more practical work: 'Designing exercises are set with the object of training the student to grasp the possibilities and limitations of machine production', while production techniques were demonstrated through factory visits, demonstrations in the School's workshops, and lectures.[680] During the third year of the course students were free to plan what they wished to do and how to do it, in consultation with their tutors, and would specialise in one aspect of their field of design, for example metal furniture, wooden furniture, or moulded plastics.[681]

By 1955 one of the recommendations of the Hambleden regarding the need for more equipment at the RCA report had obviously been acted on, as Michael Farr, in his 1955 work *Design in British Industry – A Mid-Century Survey* noted:

> The mechanical equipment of the College is a striking feature. It is best shown in the School of Wood, Metals and Plastics…The first amounts to a basic factory equipped with all except speed machines. Students learn to use them as tools to make a design accurately.[682]

Darwin himself commented on the improvement in equipment in 1954, noting that 'the various schools of the College are now accommodated and equipped on a scale which I have not seen equalled in Europe or across the Atlantic'.[683] The improvement of equipment had enabled better training to take place, which was bringing about improvements in students' employment prospects, as Darwin noted: 'Whereas once the entry of a single student into industry was celebrated in the annual report to the Minister as a success, we now place every student from the design schools, between forty and

---

[678] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[679] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[680] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[681] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[682] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 182.
[683] R. Darwin 'The Dodo and the Phoenix: The Royal College of Art since the War' *Royal Society of Arts, Journal* 102:4918 (1954: Feb5) pp. 174-188.

fifty in all, in good positions without difficulty'.[684] Evidently the RCA had taken on board recommendations from the Hambleden report and more machinery was being introduced at the College which enabled more relevant training for students.
One major development regarding furniture design had occurred at the College in 1951 was when the decision was made that the primary object of the RCA was to train designers rather than craftsmen. This led to the creation of production units within each school so that students could see their designs made up without spending large amounts of time making them up themselves.[685] Darwin commented that:

> the most important is the production unit in the Furniture Section in the School of Wood, Metals and Plastics. This unit, which makes prototypes for industry and furniture for the College and its clients, has shown itself to be one of the most significant instruments of training employed.[686]

This was a notable development as it was during the late 1950s, according to Arthur Marwick, that people started consuming much more than they had previously, and, as Sparke notes, when people started purchasing more furniture.[687] Credit was more widely available, people had more disposable income, and furniture manufacturing had to expand and develop to meet the growing need for new pieces of furniture.[688]
Sparke writes that the mass media also helped to promote domestic furniture, and design, through articles written in the press. One such article in the *Ideal Home Yearbook* was called 'At home with the Days' and focussed on Robin and Lucienne Day and the furnishings in their house.[689] Articles such as these fed into the growing interest in modern furniture on the part of the British public. In addition, the DIY movement which had been imported from the USA was becoming popular, and people were encouraged to make their own bookshelves, lamps, plant stands, coffee tables and trolleys.[690]

---

[684] *Ibid*., pp. 174-188.
[685] *Ibid*., pp. 174-188.
[686] *Ibid*., pp. 174-188.
[687] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 84.
[688] *Ibid*., p. 84.
[689] *Ibid*., p. 77.
[690] *Ibid*., p. 77.

Although the RCA was by now a postgraduate institution, Darwin recognised that decisions made about art and design education at local and regional art school level impacted on the working of the College. All students who entered the RCA had come through the Ministry of Education's curriculum and examination system, which meant that 'in many vital respects it (the RCA) must be dependent on decisions on policy in which it has no say and with which it may not wholly agree'.[691] Darwin recognised the good work many art schools were doing, but also criticised the Ministry of Education's examination system and, in a lecture given to the RSA in 1949, noted, as had the Bray report, that there was too much conformity in the system:

> I am quite sure that in its generous conception, its logic and its close coordination throughout its elements, our system of art education considered as an administrative organisation is second to none. But, unfortunately, it is just that – a system – and it is one to which, with only two or three exceptions, every art school in the country must conform. This conformity is ensured by the Ministry of Education's external examinations….[692]

These examinations, Darwin noted, had the effect of 'controlling very closely the syllabus of every course, and even its curriculum in detail…', and although changes had been recommended in the Bray report, as Darwin rightly pointed out, they were mainly concerned with assessment, and not with the course itself.[693] It was the Intermediate exam in particular which Darwin had issue with - the fact that students had to study eight or nine subjects, which Darwin felt was too broad.[694] He suggested a more 'concentrated, rigorous and confined' training, which should be aimed not at the average student, but the best student; 'framed to suit and develop a high rather than a mediocre or uncertain talent'.[695] Darwin had looked at the portfolios of students applying to the RCA and who had come through the Ministry of Education's system and found that:

---

691 R. Darwin 'The Training of the Industrial Designer' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 97:4794 (1949: May 6) pp. 421-436. Parentheses mine.
692 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436. Darwin was a painter who had attended the Slade School and then taught at both Watford Grammar School and Eton College. He then became Professor of Fine Art at King's College, Durham University, before becoming Principle of the RCA.
693 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436.
694 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436.
695 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436.

> It is not reassuring. Much of the work is well presented, some of it is suspiciously clever; technically it is mostly of a high standard. And yet, on the whole, it is curiously depressing.[696]

As he went on to note, 'This is the material which the College must mould and make useful to society and which it must make useful to industry in particular, for that is its chief responsibility'.[697] As Darwin had noted, the Ministry's examinations, even for the NDD, still controlled the curriculum quite tightly, and it was perhaps the result of this that could be seen in the work Darwin was referring to in the quotation above.

5.9 The revised National Diploma in Design at Birmingham and Leicester

By 1955 the Intermediate Certificate and NDD were well established in art schools, and both Birmingham and Leicester Colleges of Art had become 'regional' art schools; these tended to be situated in large cities and served, in part, the needs of several counties, while art schools in smaller cities and towns were known as 'local' art schools.[698] Farr, in his 1955 study *Design in British Industry*, comments that the Birmingham College of Art and Crafts, as Birmingham's art school was now called, was situated in the country's 'chief centre of industry' and occupied an important position as the centre of 'an educational system comprising thirteen schools of art', which included the branch and junior schools of the Birmingham College.[699] There were several options available during 1955-6 for Birmingham students wishing to take the NDD. They could do it as a two-year course in one special subject following the Intermediate Certificate, as a three year course in a special subject without the having first done the Intermediate Certificate, or as a two year course in a main and additional subjects after the Intermediate Certificate.[700] Furniture could be taken as a special subject for the NDD at Birmingham, but not as a main or additional subject. There was now a School of Furniture at Birmingham, with courses provided for 'Junior and Senior

---

696 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436.
697 *Ibid.*, pp. 421-436.
698 M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 162.
699 *Ibid.*, p. 166.
700 *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts Prospectus 1955-1956*, p. 22.

apprentices, Journeymen, Designers, Handcraft Teachers Certificate'.[701] The apprentice and journeymen's courses included drawing to scale, costing, setting out, and theory, and the prospectus states that 'The school is well equipped with hand and machine tools'.[702] However, as Farr noted, there was not a big demand for furniture designers in the Midlands; not enough to 'justify much stress on the designing side'. He went on to comment that:

> The furniture school caters almost entirely for day-release students aged between fifteen and twenty. They come from about sixty Midlands firms most of which are concerned with cheap mass production furniture. Faced with this and a very small demand for furniture designers, the school has been wise to stress mastery in craftsmanship carried out inevitably in the tradition of Gimson and the Barnsleys.[703]

Industrial processes and design for manufacture in furniture seem not to have been in great demand in Birmingham, and the art school was instead concentrating on quality of craftsmanship rather than modern designs. It may also have been the case that whilst the demand for designers in Birmingham was not that large, manufacturers themselves were not interested in the possibilities of employing designers. Farr also observed: 'However, much has to be done to convince Birmingham manufacturers that the best students in this school could, if given the opportunities, become first class industrial designers'.[704]

Whilst there may have not been much need for or interest in industrial designers among Midlands manufacturers, it may also have been the case that art school students themselves were not particularly keen on becoming designers for industry. The course in Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship, started in 1935, was still running at Birmingham and students on the course were drawn from various craft classes, but Farr noted that 'I got the impression that for many of them industrial design was not their first choice of subject'.[705] Within the course of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship, the furniture component comprised of 'occasional and permanent furniture in wood,

---

[701] *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts School of Furniture and Allied Crafts 1955-1956* (separate prospectus) p. 3.
[702] *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts Prospectus 1955-1956* p. 28.
[703] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 166.
[704] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[705] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

metals and plastics'.[706] During the 1950s new materials such as plastics were beginning to be used in furniture design; the benefits of these were outlined in a Timber Development Association leaflet from 1943 which had set out to reassure that although 'there seems little doubt that plastics, in one form or another, will be increasingly used in competition with and as a substitute for timber', the cost of plastic was quite high in comparison to wood, and many products that were marketed as 'plastic' were actually sheets of wood cemented together by synthetic resin.[707] There had been some concerns that within furniture making, wood could be replaced by other materials, but the Timber Development Association did not think this would be the case. The leaflet went on to note that the use of plastics in connection with woodworking had resulted in 'many new methods and uses', which would in fact result in timber still being the primary material in construction.[708] The conclusion was that 'though plastics can be harmful as a competitor, this hurt is more than counterbalanced by their merits as an adjunct to modern timber usage', and that it was 'more important to take advantage of plastics as an adjunct to modern wood-working, as plastics are opening up vast new fields of timber usage which would have been impossible a decade ago'.[709] Evidently, at Birmingham's art school, new materials and technologies were being explored and used within furniture design.

Farr noted that, as in Birmingham, demand for furniture designers in Leicester was small: however, in contrast to Birmingham's art school the furniture department at Leicester art school 'possesses the complete equipment for a modern factory, and students intending to be skilled workers carry out all their work under the most modern conditions'.[710] For the 1955-6 session the School of Industrial Design at Leicester College of Art within which Furniture was placed, offered courses 'for students who wish to enter any branch of the Furnishing Trade'.[711] Leicester's prospectus gives details of the course content for the NDD in Furniture, with components taught over the

[706] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus for the Session 1959-60* p. 31.
[707] Timber Development Association Technical Leaflet no. 5 *Plastics and Timber: A general analysis of plastics as a competitor of, and as an adjunct to timber usage* issued by the Timber Development Association Limited, (London, March 1943) p. 2. AAD/1994/16/276 (V&A Archive of Art and Design).
[708] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[709] *Ibid.*, p. 3-4.
[710] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 164.
[711] *Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design 1955-56* (separate prospectus) p 3.

duration of the course being: Design for Furniture – Hand and Machine Made; Geometry, Perspective, Lettering; Presentation, Drawing and Drawing Office methods; Theory and Methods of Production; Practical Cabinet Making; Interior Decoration and Architectural Background; Chair Design and Upholstery; History and Research; Wood Machining – Theory and Practical Methods of Production.[712] There were around 2600 students at Leicester in 1955: 550 full-time, 800 part-time and 1250 'evening and occasional' students, and Farr noted that each year, around ten students passed out of the furniture courses.[713] He went on to note that aside from those wishing to be art teachers, 'all these students are found jobs in the industry suited to the design training which they have received at the college, but not all of them are taken on as designers straight away'.[714] The art school was also noted for its policy of not enrolling more students than could be placed in jobs in industry or in teaching or post diploma work at other art schools.[715] The Leicester art school was also noteworthy because it continued to share the same building as the Technical College and was run in conjunction with it, sharing facilities and teaching for some related courses. One of the recommendations of the Bray report had been the closer linking of art and design education with technical and commercial education, and Leicester was one art school where this was already occurring.

5.10 Views of industrialists

On the 24 September 1957, a one-day conference for manufacturers, designers and educationalists was held to 'try and establish the level of design accomplishment, both technical and aesthetic, which the manufacturers considered essential in their design recruits.'[716] The conference was the culmination of an enquiry by the Federation of British Industries' Industrial Art Committee into the needs of industry concerning the

[712] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[713] M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey* (Cambridge, 1955) p. 164.
[714] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[715] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[716] *The Training of Designers for Industry: Furniture, Pottery, Printing and Textiles* Report of a One-Day Conference Between Industrialists and Educationalists (London, 1957) p. v.

training for designers for the pottery, furniture, printing, and textiles industries.[717] The four industries were included in the enquiry as they were commonly taught in art schools, and were industries in which freelance or staff designers were often employed. In his introduction to the conference, Sir Norman Kipping, Director General of the Federation of British Industries noted that developments in new materials and the competition for trade pointed to the fact that the need for design for industry, and designers, would become even more pressing. This, he commented, would present art schools with new difficulties, saying that 'It is harder now to maintain close links with industrial processes and to be in touch with the possibilities and limitations of mass production methods'.[718] After the Second World War, technologies and materials which had been developed for the aircraft industry were utilised in the furniture industry, and these developments had an impact on the teaching at art schools. New materials such as waterproof plywoods, the use of aluminium, magnesium and stainless steel, plastics technology, and the development of new synthetic resins, were all technologies that had been developed during the war but were now being incorporated into the furniture industry. During the war, Anthony Heal, of the forward-looking furniture company Heals, was anticipating the potential uses of these new materials in the post-war period. Correspondence exists from 1943 outlining appointments made by Heal with representatives from De La Rue Plastics, The Micanite & Insulators Co. Ltd and Hordern-Richmond Aircraft Ltd regarding the use of impregnated plywoods and synthetic materials, and with British Tego Gluefilm Ltd regarding the use bonding agents in furniture manufacture after the war.[719] As Sparke notes, none of these new materials were developed *by* furniture manufacturers themselves, as they were generally

---

[717] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[718] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[719] Copy of note from Anthony Heal to HP Bridge, De La Rue Plastics Ltd, 8 June 1943; Letter from AAD Lang, Research Director, Hordern-Richmond Aircraft Ltd to Anthony Heal, 4 June 1942; Copy of note from Anthony Heal to Major Mohr, The Micanite & Insulators Co Ltd, 10 June 1943; Copy of letter from Anthony Heal to British Tego Gluefilm Ltd, 15 June 1943. AAD/1994/16/276 V&A Archive of Art and Design. De La Rue Plastics, based in Walthamstow, produced goods made from phenolic resins and phenolic cloth laminate sheeting, which was used for telephones. Hordern-Richmond Aircraft were dealers in and manufacturers of aircraft components. www.gracesguide.co.uk - accessed 22/2/15. The Micanite & Insulators Co. produced electrical insulation for a wide range of products in a variety of materials, including mica, micanite and silicon. British Tego Gluefilm was a subsidiary company of The Micanite and Insulators Co., set up after the government asked the M&I Co. to produce the waterproof laminate (Tego) for aircraft propellers.
http://static.mimaterials.com/mimaterials/documents/MI%20Materials%20History%20Booklet.Dec09pdf.pdf p.12.

undertaking war-work or had ceased furniture production during the war years, but 'after the war new ideas were ready and waiting to be applied to manufacture'.[720] The furniture industry in the 1950s was comprised mainly of large firms: in 1950 there were 2824 firms manufacturing furniture in Britain, and although this had dropped to 1714 by 1958, the remaining firms were larger and produced more furniture.[721] The general picture of the furniture industry at the end of the 1950s and into the 1960s was, as Sparke comments, an emphasis on 'standardization, rationalization and automation'.[722] While the idea of training students 'for industry' was a worthy one, firms would inevitably have had their own ways of working and different processes and machinery so it was impossible, as various bodies such as the CoID and the Bray Committee had noted, to give students a 'complete' industrial training in art schools.

Representatives from the furniture industry who attended the 1957 conference had the chance to discuss amongst themselves the issue of training designers for the furniture industry. Members of the Furniture Group included three members of staff from Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts, one of which was H Brandon, then Head of the School of Furniture. There were also five members of staff (including RD Russell) from the RCA; several members of staff, including EE Pullée, from Leicester College of Art; Jack Pritchard from the Furniture Development Council, and representatives from, among others, furniture companies Heals, Stag, Parker Knoll, Harris Lebus, Ernest Race, and Hille & Co. Several questions were asked of the furniture group, the first one (and the answer) being:

> Does industry value the NDD as a qualification for design recruits?' We find, generally speaking, that the furniture industry does not; it hardly knows about it. The NDD is regarded as being primarily a teaching qualification. For that reasons I think I can skip the next two questions – whether the industry is satisfied with the aesthetic and technical training received by NDD students – as they hardly arise.[723]

---

[720] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 52.
[721] *Ibid*., p. 84.
[722] *Ibid*., p. 84.
[723] *The Training of Designers for Industry: Furniture, Pottery, Printing and Textiles* Report of a One-Day Conference Between Industrialists and Educationalists (London, 1957) Ambrose Heal was Chairman of the Furniture Group at the conference.

Another question raised at the conference was whether art schools could provide a 'complete training'.[724] One manufacturer from a large company thought that it was not possible: and he only regarded students as 'raw material', and thought that what students needed was a liberal education and an understanding of the 'facts of life'- appreciation of what the situation was in ordinary homes up and down the country, if they were going to design furniture appropriate for those houses.[725]

In a memorandum circulated before the conference, and used as a basis for the group discussions, manufacturers and members of the Industrial Art Committee (of the Federation of British Industries) had laid out their concerns regarding the training of designers. The points they wished to make were as follows:

1. Manufacturers do not expect schools to provide more technical training; each firm tends to devise its own special machinery and it is sufficient for students to be made familiar only with basic technical processes.
2. But art students tend to concentrate on the craft approach whereas the trend in industry is towards mass production.
3. Few designers appreciate the industrial and commercial problems which must be considered when a new design is planned and they do not understand that they must work as members of an industrial team, perhaps at the expense of their own individuality.
4. Few of the technical members of the team appreciate the designer's problems
5. Firms in the main give too low a status to the young designer.[726]

It is interesting to see that that manufacturers did not expect art schools to provide a complete training for students – that there was some 'top up' training that would need to be done once students entered employment, and also that manufacturers had given designers too low a status in the past. Various reports in the past (*Design and the Designer in Industry,* the Hambledon report, for example) had noted that manufacturers needed to meet the art schools 'half way' so to speak, but it seems that manufacturers were now willing to do this. It is also of interest that manufacturers noted that students had concentrated on craft for too long, whereas the emphasis now was on machinery and technical processes. In addition it was not deemed sufficient for a designer to now work on his or her own, separate from the production process: they had to be able to

[724] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[725] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[726] *Ibid.*, p. 37 (Appendix A).

understand and work with other members of the team. Although the introduction of the NDD had been intended to give students a more vocational and industrially relevant training, it seems that ten years after it was introduced, manufacturers and industrialists were not seeing the benefits of these changes and were concerned that students were either concentrating too much on craft, or were being given too much potentially irrelevant technical knowledge.

It was therefore felt that art schools could still do more to prepare students to fit into industry; one suggestion was the introduction of sandwich courses which would include a placement with industry for a year before students took their final year at art school.[727] Skills that manufacturers considered important for students to gain at art school were the ability to work as part of a team, the confidence to stand up for themselves when dealing with members of the production team, and also the awareness that a designer is only one member of a large team.[728] Interestingly, and as outlined in point one of the memorandum (cited above), manufacturers stated that they did not require students to have a lot of technical knowledge, and in fact it was 'undesirable that they should be dominated by machines'.[729] RD Russell told of the teaching at the RCA, where students were taught firstly to analyse design problems and break them down to their basic facts. Students were then taught an understanding of quality, and finally an understanding of technique, so that they could bear in mind the limitations of the material in their designs.[730] One manufacturer agreed with Russell that this was a desirable approach, and then went on to say that he felt designers coming from art schools into furniture businesses needed to be adaptable.[731] It seems from the discussions at the conference that *some* technical and industrial knowledge would be a good thing for furniture design students to have, but more important was the ability to work as part of a team and be flexible in the way they worked so that they could adapt to various ways of working and different processes within the furniture industry.

[727] *Ibid.*, p. 37 (Appendix A).
[728] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[729] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[730] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[731] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

During the 1959-60 session, Birmingham's art school catered for 'industrial designers, craftsmen, teachers and others,' as well as those 'intending to enter one of the artistic professions'.[732] Courses were available for senior workers, apprentices journeymen and others already engaged in industry, those who intended to be craftsmen, architects, painters, sculptors, book illustrators and teachers of art, and also for those who wished to widen their knowledge of arts and crafts.[733] For full time students, the NDD was available as a two or three year course, depending on whether or not the Intermediate Certificate had been completed, and City and Guilds of London Institute courses were also available.[734] Within the School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship, students could take full time courses leading to the NDD in either Furniture Design, Product Design or Interior Design, while part time day and evening courses were also available for those already engaged as designers or draughtsmen in industry.[735] The curriculum for furniture was comprised of draughtsmanship, presentation techniques, workshop activities and designing occasional and permanent furniture in wood, metals and plastics.[736] Between 1958 and 1968 Birmingham students had the chance to spend four weeks in a drawing office or works to gain industrial experience during the summer vacations. From the prospectus it appears that students could either take the NDD in Furniture either as part of the School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship or within the School of Furniture and Allied Crafts. It is not clear if the course in the School of Furniture was more craft oriented than the course in the School of Industrial Design as the description for the furniture course within the School of Industrial Design and Draughtsmanship refers to designing 'occasional furniture in wood, metals and plastics', but the description for the School of Furniture merely states that 'Classes are held for students who wish to take the Ministry of Education National Diploma in Design in Furniture and Special level.'[737] It can be safely assumed that aspects of the courses were different as it would have been odd to have two identical courses running at the same art school.

---

[732] *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts prospectus 1959-60* p. 12.
[733] *Ibid.*, p. 12.
[734] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[735] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[736] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[737] *Birmingham College of Art and Crafts prospectus 1959-60* p. 31 & *School of Furniture and Allied Crafts* (separate leaflet) p. 3.

The School of Industrial Design prospectus at Leicester art school for the 1958-59 session notes that the School 'is equipped to meet the training requirements of potential designers for industry'.[738] The introduction to the School of Industrial Design noted that:

> The expanding role of the designer in industry is being increasingly recognised as the problems of form, technique and appearance emerge as major factors in volume manufacturing and marketing. The designer is not only responsible for the functional and visual qualities of the product but also makes an important contribution in the development and direction of the overall concept of mass produced units.[739]

Courses were available for full time students with courses leading to the Leicester College of Art Diploma in Industrial Design, the NDD, and RCA entrance exams, while full-time, part-time day and evening courses were also available for 'the study of design and craftsmanship in relation to local industries'; some of these led to City and Guilds of London Institute qualifications.[740] As at Birmingham, students were also encouraged to spend time in industry during vacations, with four weeks in industry during the summer vacation prior to the start of the final year a compulsory part of the NDD.

By the end of the 1950s the NDD was well established, the RCA had been reformed and reorganised, and both it and local and regional art schools appear to have been catering more to the needs of industry and providing their students with more appropriate training. Industrial placements were offered to students in some art schools (such as Birmingham and the RCA) and the use of new materials such as plastics were being incorporated into furniture design training.

5.11 Reviewing the National Diploma in Design

738 *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology 1958-9: Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design* p. 5.
739 *Ibid.*, p. 5.
740 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Although the NDD enabled art schools to put forward courses for examination and to therefore concentrate on subjects appropriate to the industries in the local area or areas of strength within the art school, the Ministry of Education and the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations (NACAEx) decided to review the system again and in 1957 the NACAEx published their *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the length of the Diploma Course*; this was the result of the Development Sub-Committee of the NACAEx held during 1956. The Committee noted that the present examination system – the Intermediate Certificate followed by the NDD – had helped promote high standards in art schools in England and Wales, but they felt that the examination requirements tended to restrict originality and initiative in planning courses and teaching within art schools.[741] There may have also been consideration of the views of industrialists and manufacturers that the NDD was not viewed as a qualification that was relevant to industry and that students did not need as much technical training as perhaps was previously thought. The changes proposed by the NACAEx were major; they considered that 'the Ministry's direct responsibility for conducting the art examinations, a responsibility which it no longer exercises in any other field of study, should be brought to an end'.[742] If this happened, it would mark the end of almost 130 years of government control over art and design education, which had begun with the foundation of the Government School of Design in 1837. Some had already called for this change to be made; Darwin, in a paper given to the Royal Society of Arts in 1954 stated that:

> First then, I believe that any educational institution, and here I speak only of its teaching members, must have the unfettered right to select its own students, to devise its own methods of teaching those students and the opportunity to implement them. It must have the right to frame its own examinations and to examine its students without influence or interference from others outside its membership, and to equally grant its own awards.[743]

Darwin was not just referring to the RCA; his comments were about the whole of the art and design education system. As Darwin was on both the NACAEx and NACAEd, he was no doubt pleased that the changes he had spoken about previously were taking

---

[741] Ministry of Education / National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course* (London, 1957) p 7.
[742] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[743] Darwin, R 'The Dodo and the Phoenix: The Royal College of Art since the War' *Royal Society of Arts, Journal* 102:4918 (1954: Feb5) pp. 174-188.

place. These were not changes that could take place overnight, however. The NACAEx was in favour of initially giving some art schools, which were 'well able to bear responsibility for planning courses and examining students,' even more freedom and control over their own courses so that they could set their own curricula and carry out all examinations internally.[744] However because standards across art schools, or even within larger art schools between subjects were not consistent, the Committee did not want to scrap the existing examination arrangements straight away, but bring in changes in stages. They recommended that: 'the schools which are ready for this change should be given greater freedom, and that further progress should be made in this direction as more schools become ready to take over the responsibility.[745]

To aid this transition, the NACAEx recommended that another body be set up to take control of the central examinations still in existence, and to grant exemption from them as and when art schools began to gain independence. The Committee recommended that a Council for Art Education be set up for this purpose, and that it should also advise the Ministry of Education 'from time to time on matters of art in higher education'.[746] The recommendation was that this new Council should comprise 28 members, including five appointed by the Minister for Education, one from the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce, and 22 from other bodies concerned with the arts, education or manufacture.[747] The purpose of the proposed Council was to approve courses which would still run under the existing central examination system, decide which new courses could now be internally assessed by individual art schools, and award the National Diploma in Design regardless of how the courses were assessed.[748] It was for the Council to select the schools that were able to take responsibility for

---

[744] Ministry of Education / National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course* (London, 1957) p.7.
[745] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[746] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[747] Members on the Council were to include representatives from the Arts Council; Association of Art Institutions; Association of Education Committees; Association of Municipal Corporations; Association of Principles of Technical Institutions; Council of Industrial Design; County Councils Association; London County Council; National Society for Art Education; Royal Academy of Arts; Royal College of Art; Royal Institute of British Architects; Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce; Society of Industrial Artists; University Schools of Art; Welsh Joint Education Committee. *Ibid.*, p.. 8.
[748] Ministry of Education / National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course* (London, 1957) p 9.

running their own examinations. As the report states: 'Clearly several factors would have to be taken into account such as the success achieved in examinations in the past, the suitability of the teaching staff, the equipment and accommodation available, the range of work, the number of students and relations with industry'.[749]

One of the main recommendations the Council made in the report was that the Intermediate Examination – usually taken by students before going on to the National Diploma in Design - be stopped.[750] With the ending of the Intermediate Examination, and the Council's opinion that a 'good general education' was of 'great importance' to the art student, it was felt that before starting the National Diploma students should 'follow a broad introductory course, either in a secondary school, or in an art school where the course should cover most of the ground in the present Intermediate course but should be so treated as to promote the general education of the student'.[751]
Following the introductory course, it was recommended then that the full-time course leading to the National Diploma in Design should last for three years, instead of the existing two, and that students should be 18 years old before starting the course.[752] The Council went on to recommend that the first year of the course should be broad, with specialisation later on in the course; their reason for an additional year was that it would 'make it possible for subjects to be studied in greater depth, but students would also be enabled to acquire a further knowledge of the whole field of art and design…'.[753] This would make art and design courses similar to university degree courses and the desire to do this was confirmed by the Minister for Education in his response to the *Report on Proposed Changes etc.*, which was outlined in *Circular 340,* dated 14 July 1958.[754] He accepted the main recommendations of the *Report on Proposed Changes etc.*, and was in agreement with the NACAEx that the Ministry of Education should give up direct responsibility for art examinations, and that the Intermediate Certificate should also be

[749] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[750] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[751] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[752] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[753] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[754] Ministry of Education *Circulars and Administrative Memoranda: issued during the period 1 April 1958 – 31 March 1959* (London, 1959).

abolished.[755] The Minister of Education hoped that the proposed three-year Diploma course 'would approximate in quality and standard of achievement to a university course of the same length leading to a first degree'.[756] This may well have been in response to the comments at the 1957 conference that the NDD was not well regarded by industry; it could have been that university degrees were more highly regarded, and by ensuring that Diploma courses were of the same length and similar standard, they may be more well regarded by industrialists and manufacturers.

The Minister for Education reiterated that numbers of students training full-time in art schools were small, and were likely to remain so, and that 'the main volume of work for the great majority of art schools has consisted, and will continue to consist, of work of other kinds…'.[757] The first task of the Minister was to set up a National Advisory Council on Art Education (NACAEd) which would replace the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations, and 'whose terms of reference will cover all aspects of art in Further Education except architectural education…'.[758] It was to be for the NACAEd to recommend the type of courses that should be provided and the general terms of their content, but the Minister felt that all students should have some fine art training and students should not specialise too narrowly.[759] It seems there was an intention to replace the NDD with a different qualification, as the Minister's *Circular* notes that the Council was to lay down the 'academic conditions which courses designed to lead to the new diploma must satisfy, for approving syllabuses and for awarding the diplomas'.[760] The word 'new' in that statement suggests at the very least some re-organisation of the current qualification, if not a new one altogether. The Minister also thought that the new system should comprise a small number of grouped courses rather than the many single subject courses that could be taken for the NDD, and that the categories of 'Special', 'Main' and 'Additional' subjects could be ended.[761] The Minister of Education:

---

[755] *Ibid.*, para. 10.
[756] *Ibid.*, para. 7.
[757] *Ibid.*, para. 3.
[758] *Ibid.*, para. 5.
[759] *Ibid.*, para. 8.
[760] *Ibid.*, para. 11.
[761] *Ibid.*, para. 8.

> believes that closer association between art schools and those branches of industry and commerce which employ designers is essential. He will therefore ask the Council to consider this mater and, in particular, to explore the possibility of encouraging the introduction of some advanced art courses which include a period of training 'on the job'.[762]

The National Diploma in Design already allowed for students to spend four weeks in industry during their vacations, in order to gain some industrial experience, but it seems that the Minister for Education wanted a longer period in industry that was also a compulsory element of the course, rather than a voluntary one as was the case with the NDD.

5.12 More freedom for art schools: The Coldstream Report

Following the Minister of Education's *Circular 340* the National Advisory Council on Art Examinations was abolished, and the National Advisory Council on Art Education (NACAEd) was established to oversee the new diploma and examination system. One of the members of the old NACAEx, Sir William Coldstream, Slade Professor of Fine Art at the University of London, was Chair of the NACAEd, and the *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (known as the Coldstream report), was published in 1960. Others on the Council included EE Pullée who had been on the NACAEx; Robin Darwin, Principal of the RCA and also previously on the NACAEx; Misha Black, Professor of Industrial Design (Engineering) at the RCA, Nikolaus Pevsner, architectural historian and author of *Industrial Art in England*, Stewart Mason, Director of Education of Leicester City Council, and Oliver Lebus, Chairman of Harris Lebus, the furniture manufacturer and wholesalers. The aim of the NACAEd was to 'advise the Minister on all aspects of art education in further education…', and the Coldstream report was concerned with 'the content and administration of courses for an award to take the place of the National Diploma in Design'.[763] As Strand notes, the NACAEd recognised that the NDD had raised standards in art and design education,

---

[762] *Ibid.*, para.. 8.

[763] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p 1 & Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (London, 1960) p. iii.

and this was indicated by the rise in pass rates in more recent years compared with pass rates in 1946 & 1947.

Overall pass rates for the NDD (percentage of those taking the exam who passed)

	List A	List B	NDD (List A & B distinction ended)
1946	49%	44%	
1947	43%	49%[764]	
1958			78%
1959			75%
1960			81%[765]

Even so, the Minister of Education wished to raise standards further to bring art and design education more in line with university degrees, and recommended that those starting the new course should be 18 years old and have reached a satisfactory standard of general education. The Coldstream report followed the recommendation of the Minister for Education that a pre-diploma course, broadly equivalent to the Intermediate Certificate and lasting one academic year, should be completed before starting the diploma course.[766] Each art school would be free to arrange their own pre-diploma course 'without reference to any national body', but the Coldstream report stated that the general aim of the pre diploma course should be to 'train students in observation, analysis, creative work and technical control through the study of line, form, colour and space relationships in two and three dimensions'.[767] In addition, it was recommended that some study of the history of art and some complementary studies be included and examined as part of the final examinations, and each student should learn about the history of their subject; a furniture course should include the history of furniture, for example. The report also recommended that 'complementary studies' should form part of the diploma course, but was not particularly specific about what these complementary studies should be. All the authors stated was that 'we mean any non-studio subjects, in addition to the history of art, which may strengthen or give breadth to

[764] Ministry of Education *Report of the Committee on Art Examinations* (London, 1948) p. 22-3.
[765] Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (London, 1960) p. 21.
[766] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[767] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

the students' training'.[768] Previous art school courses had given students lectures on the history of their subject, but this had not formed part of the final examinations. The Coldstream report stipulated that no more than 15% of the exam should consist of history and complementary studies.[769] For the first time, a satisfactory standard of general education was required from students wishing to undertake the diploma; the NACAEd felt this was necessary in addition to completion of the pre-diploma course so that the diploma itself could be said to be of 'graduate equivalent' status.[770] It was recommended, therefore, that students wishing to take the pre-diploma course have five 'O' level passes (or an equivalent combination of 'O' and 'A' levels), three of which should be in 'academic' subjects – one of these should evidence a student's ability to use English.[771]

5.13 The structure of the new diploma

The new diploma was to be constructed upon seven principles: it was to approximate in standard and quality a university course leading to a degree; it was to last three years; those starting the course should have a good standard of general education; they should also be able to show some evidence of ability in art; all students should receive some training in fine art as a basis for any later specialisation; students should not be allowed to specialise too narrowly; the new diploma should be based on a small number of grouped courses, rather than the 'Heinz 57 varieties' of the NDD.[772] The group headings under which these courses were to come were Fine Art, Graphic Design, Three Dimensional Design, and Textiles / Fashion, and the major part of a students' work should come under one of these groups, though supporting studies could be added from another group if necessary.[773] Those on the NACAEd felt that during the first part of the diploma course 'the student should be given the opportunity of exploring his area of specialisation and should in any case experiment in different media and different

[768] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[769] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[770] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[771] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[772] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[773] *Ibid.*, p. 5

materials'.[774] Strand notes that the envisaged progression of the student through art and design education was 'from the introductory, exploratory and diagnostic pre-diploma course, through a broad treatment of his or her chief study in the diploma course itself, towards a greater, though never narrow, degree of final specialisation'.[775]

Regarding three dimensional design, the Coldstream report noted that 'students in this area may eventually be employed in industry or they may choose to work as studio craftsmen or become teachers'.[776] It was therefore for the individual art schools to decide to weight their courses in favour of industrial production or fine craftsmanship, as they saw fit. Whatever the art school chose to do, students should still be given the opportunity either to explore a range of three dimensional design subjects, or to concentrate more on one or two subjects if they wished.[777] It seems that following the very specialised NDD, which was oriented towards industry, the new diploma was to be more flexible and would allow a focus on industrial design or studio crafts as art schools saw fit. This may have been as result of the Minister for Education's statement that he thought the numbers of students training full-time in art schools was likely to remain small, therefore one broader qualification which could give these students several career options would be better than several qualifications – one for teachers and one for industrial designers, for example. It seems part-time students were still in the majority at art schools and it was there that the focus of art schools should be.[778]

The NACAEd realised that replacing the NDD with a higher standard, degree-equivalent course, would mean that some students currently on NDD courses would not be suitable for the new Dip A.D.[779] The Coldstream report observed that within industry there were different levels of design and therefore designers of differing levels of

---

[774] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[775] Strand, R *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 11.
[776] Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (London, 1960) p 7.
[777] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[778] Ministry of Education *Circulars and Administrative Memoranda: issued during the period 1 April 1958 – 31 March 1959* (London, 1959) para 3.
[779] Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (London, 1960) p 15.

knowledge and skill would be required.[780] There were also workers within industry who were perhaps not able enough to be designers, but who were 'sufficiently responsive to the ideas of those who are, to be able to interpret their designs perceptively and sympathetically'; the NACAEd felt that art schools could continue to provide training for these students and therefore, new courses of a more vocational focus than the new diploma course should be introduced to cater for them.[781] The new award for full-time students was to be called the Diploma in Art and Design (Dip A.D), and the Coldstream report recommended that an independent body be set up to administer the new Dip A.D – independent not only of the NACAEd but also the Minister of Education himself.[782] Art schools and colleges were given time to plan and submit courses for the new Dip A.D and the new qualifications would begin to be introduced in 1963.

5.14 The Diploma in Art and Design

Following the Coldstream report's recommendation that the new Dip A.D should be overseen by an independent body, the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (NCDAD) was founded in 1961, with Sir John Summerson as chairman. Amongst other duties, the NCDAD would approve courses for the Diploma and also advise the Ministry of Education from time to time on matters relating to the Dip A.D. Strand notes that the general concept and terms of reference for the NCDAD were in fact not new; they followed a pattern already in place for the National Council for Technological Awards which had been established in 1955 and which administered the Diploma in Technology (Dip Tech).[783] He also suggests that although the NCDAD represented 'a completely new deal in art and design education' because it signified the 'final emancipation of that sector from central governmental control of examinations and, to some extent, of the courses themselves', art and design education was not entirely clear of government involvement as it still had to look to the Ministry of Education and local

[780] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[781] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
Ibid., p. 9.
[783] Strand, R *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 13.

education authorities for funding for equipment, accommodation or staffing for courses.[784] All NDD courses had to have been approved by the Ministry of Education, and 70% of assessments were awarded by the art schools themselves, with the remaining 30% awarded by external assessors from the Ministry. The new Dip A.D courses still had to be approved, though now it was by an external body, the NCDAD, supposedly free from government influence, and exams were assessed internally by art schools, with moderation being undertaken by the NCDAD. The desire to set high academic standards in the new Dip A.D led to many applications for approval of courses to be rejected. Art schools which did not have their courses approved at the first attempt could apply the following year(s) for approval and once approved, courses were reviewed every five years. Seventy-two colleges submitted 201 applications for approval of courses; of these only 61 courses in just 29 colleges were approved for the first year of the Dip A.D, which was to be in September 1963.[785]

5.15 The Diploma in Art and Design at Leicester

Leicester College of Art introduced the Dip A.D at the start of the 1963-4 academic year, and initially five subjects within Three Dimensional Design were approved; Silversmithing, Industrial Design (Engineering), Furniture, Ceramics, and Interior Design.[786] Students could take a Diploma in Three Dimensional Design following two routes; the first as part of a five-year course within the School of Teacher Training for those wishing to become art and design teachers, and the second within the Faculty of Industrial Design following the 'usual' three year Diploma course on its own. The Leicester prospectus states that the aim of the Dip A.D is to 'develop the student's education on a broad basis rather than on a narrow vocational one, with the aim of producing a creative designer capable of informed and personal decision'.[787] Leicester's

[784] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[785] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[786] National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1964) Appendix III.
[787] *Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design Prospectus 1963-64* p. 7.

prospectus gives detailed information about the content of the Diploma course (in Three Dimensional Design), and is worth reproducing here:

General description of course – 3 yr. full time.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Studio/workshop	4 hrs. per week	3	specialisation
Metalwork shops*	4	3	in product design,
Woodwork shops*	4	3	furniture design,
Plastics workshops*	-	3	ceramics, silver
Ceramics studio*	4	3	design, interior
Design research*	5	5	design or
Drawing offices	7	7	exhibition design
Environmental des	3	3	= 27 hrs.
Fine art/general studies	7	7	7

* taken in periods of 3 or 4 weeks intensive study.

Lectures

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
General history of art	1 hr. per week	1	1
History of design – general	1	1	-
- specialist	-	-	1
science (mechanics/heat /light/sound/elect)	2	2	-
industrial admin	1	1	1
Criticisms	as required…..		1
Tutorials	1	1	2

In the prospectus for 1963-4 there is no mention of an industrial placement for students, though this was introduced subsequently; by the 1966-7 session students were encouraged to spend time in industry during the vacations and before the final year of the course there was a compulsory four week minimum period in industry during the summer vacation.[788]

The course for Designs in Construction in Wood is also set out in detail in Leicester's 1966-7 prospectus, and again, is worth reproducing here to gain a sense of the skills and knowledge students were being given while at art school:

[788] *Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design Prospectus 1963-64.* p. 38 & *Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design Prospectus 1966-67* p. 100.

Programme year 1 Designs for constructions in Wood
(6 hours per week, 4 practical, 2 hrs. design, research/model making etc.)

Two dimensional form -	colour, texture, shape
Three dimensional form -	shape, volume, texture, proportions
	textual, colour and mechanical results of cutting timber
Constructional design -	methods of jointing by hand (temp and perm)
	aesthetic interest in shapes of joints
	hardware and adhesives
	experimental projects
Laminating and bending	materials used
	technical and colour change in cutting laminates
	possibilities and limitations
Machine forms	(using hand power tools and simple machines)
	two dimensions
	three dimensions – elementary
	geometric and organic forms
	experiments with texture
Wood finishes	aesthetic qualities acquired by different methods and materials – linked with fine art
Structural values of materials	(supported by factory and field visits)
	natural and synthetic, and their effects on construction design and use.

Programme year 2 Design for constructions in wood
(6 hrs. per week, 4 practical, 2 hrs. research/modelling etc.)

Laminating and bending	development from first year
Machine forms	(using the full range of basic woodworking machines)
	techniques of machinery
	experimental projects
Relationship between machine and hand production methods	
	industrial processes in various braches of industry (supported by factory visits)
Wood finishes	development form first year
Laminated plastics	their manufacture and experimental use of colour, texture, forming and usage
Adhesives	(advanced) development from first year
Structural values of materials	development from first year

Programme year 3 Chief Studies – all specialisations
(33 hrs. per week)

The final year will be a period of personal discovery and consolidation. The course will be tailored to suit the individual requirement of each student.[789]

5.16 The Diploma in Art and Design at Birmingham

The Dip A.D at Birmingham was introduced in 1964 and the school was only initially approved for two Dip A.D courses within Three Dimensional Design; Jewellery and Silversmithing, and Industrial Design (Engineering).[790] Within other faculties, Birmingham was approved for Painting, Sculpture, Graphic Design, Woven & Printed Textiles, and Textiles – fashion.[791] A letter from the NCDAD to the Chief Education Officer at the City of Birmingham Education Committee dated 15 February 1965 states that the Furniture course has been approved subject to certain conditions being met, but doesn't state what those conditions were.[792] A further letter, dated 6 July 1965, from the Department of Education and Science to the Birmingham Education Authority confirms the approval of the Furniture course for the Dip A.D, so it would be reasonable to assume that those conditions had been met in the interim, and indeed, the Dip A.D in Furniture stared at Birmingham in September 1965.[793] Birmingham's various schools and departments had been reorganised into four faculties matching the four subject areas recommended in the Coldstream report. There were now faculties of Fine Art, Graphic Design, Three Dimensional Design, and Textiles and Fashion.[794] The prospectus for Birmingham for the 1964-5 session states that Diploma students specialised in certain principal subjects, and this specialisation took place within a 'broad but definable area of study'.[795] The first and second years of Diploma courses included the study of subjects within the relevant area but if appropriate, subjects from other areas could be studied to complement a student's work. During the third year, the intention was that a student should 'attain a high professional standard in his chief

[789] *Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design Prospectus 1966-67* p 99-100.
[790] National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1964) Appendix III & *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1964-65* p. 63.
[791] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1964-65* p. 17.
[792] Birmingham College of Art and Crafts 1965-67 ED/167/267 (The National Archive)
[793] *Ibid*.
[794] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1964-65* p 16.
[795] *Ibid*., p. 18.

study', but they were also encouraged to engage in 'free fine art activities unhampered by limitations other than those inherent in the creative process….Such activity is not tied to utility, or to material, or to techniques…'.[796] Within the Department of Three Dimensional Design, the School of Furniture had been approved by the NCDAD for both two and three-years courses in Furniture leading to the Dip A.D. Whilst entrants to the Dip A.D courses had to be eighteen years old, the School of Furniture also ran a three-year full-time vocational course in Design Development which provided 'a comprehensive training in drawing office practice, technology of materials and processes, some practical work and industrial experience during the summer vacation', and was open to those aged sixteen or older.[797] Courses were also still available for apprentices and young learners who were released by their employers to study at the college; these courses included study of the principles of design, working drawings, costing, and technology of materials and processes.[798]

As well as Dip A.D courses, Birmingham held courses leading to professional qualifications in the Architecture and Planning, and to the Final Examinations of the City and Guilds of London Institute. They also offered a one-year post-diploma course leading to the University of Birmingham Institute of Education Certificate in Education and the Art Teacher's Diploma (also awarded by the University of Birmingham).[799] Some courses relating to local trades and industries still existed, which could lead to the College's internal diploma, and part time, day release and evening courses were still running for apprentices and journeymen.[800] While Birmingham had introduced the Dip A.D, it was still providing courses for the part time students, something which the Minister of Education had stressed was still important, as the numbers of students training full-time in art schools was predicted to remain fairly small.

5.17 Review of courses submitted for the Diploma in Art and Design

[796] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[797] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[798] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[799] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[800] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1964-65* p. 20.

In 1964 the NCDAD published the *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design*, which was a review of both the first schemes that had been submitted to the Council for approval as Dip A.D courses and the initial implementation of the Dip A.D. The NCDAD reiterated the aim of the Diploma as set out in the 1960 Coldstream report:

> the aim should be to produce courses conceived as a liberal education in art in which specialisation should be related to one of a small number of broad areas or, to put it another way, that a subject that is principally emphasised should always be studied in a broad context.[801]

The Coldstream report had recommended that the Dip A.D was to approximate in standard and length a university degree course, and this was interpreted by the NCDAD as meaning the Dip A.D was not to become overly academic with students spending large amounts of time in lecture rooms, and neither were they to lead mainly to teaching careers.[802] The 'academic' side of the Dip A.D was covered with the introduction of History of Art and Complementary Studies, which were to take up 15% of the total course, and the rest of the course was to be more practical work.[803] The Council's view was that the Dip A.D should be 'to develop and uphold art education of a kind which will be a proper seed-ground for any career in art and design and will develop a young artists' abilities to their utmost extent, whether he is going to live by selling his works, by the practice of design, or by teaching'.[804] This view of the Dip A.D suggests that the range of it was to be quite broad, and the aim rather vague, especially as it was to cater for those wishing to teach, work as designers, or be independent designer-makers. This was perhaps recognised by the Council as they acknowledged that for some subjects post-Diploma training would be required.

The *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* had been an assessment of 'the ability of each applicant college to conduct Diploma courses at a level significantly higher than that of the NDD and in due conformity with the ideas set forth in the Coldstream Report; and, furthermore, the ability to commence such courses

---

[801] National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1964) Para 2.
[802] *Ibid*., para 2.
[803] *Ibid*., para. 2.
[804] *Ibid*., para 2.

in the Autumn of 1963'.[805] The NCDAD found that often in art colleges and art departments the physical space was not suited to Dip A.D study, and commented that more new buildings were required which could offer more flexible space for students and staff.[806] Birmingham's art school had begun a major new building project in 1962 – part one of this was complete by 1968 and housed eight major schools of the College, the administrative offices, the library, and staff and students refectories and common room.[807] As the 1968-9 prospectus noted, 'In the light of recent developments brought about by the report of the National Advisory Council for Art Education, Birmingham has perhaps been fortunate in the timing of its move to new premises', perhaps a recognition that improved facilities had helped the art school to be approved for Dip A.D courses.[808] The NCDAD had found that technical equipment was well provided for in art colleges, which was an improvement on the situation in the 1930s when *Design and the Designer in Industry* and Pevsner's *Industrial Art in England* noted that technical equipment was lacking in some art schools.

The Coldstream report had anticipated that the most usual form of organisation would be that art schools and art departments would be approved for two areas of study, however, the NCDAD found this not to be the case. Twenty-nine art schools were approved for Dip A.D study for the start of the 1963-4 academic year; nine of these were approved for study in one area only, mostly for Fine Art. Thirteen art schools were approved for courses in two areas of study, three gained approval for courses in three areas of study, and four art schools (including Leicester and Birmingham) were approved for Dip AD courses in all four areas of study.[809] Each art school was entirely responsible for planning its own courses, using the Coldstream report as a guide as to the general principles they were expected to follow.[810] Within the Three Dimensional Design subject area, the chief studies that students could take for the Diploma course were ceramics, furniture, glass, interior design, industrial design (engineering) and

---

[805] *Ibid.*, para 5.
[806] *Ibid.*, para 17.
[807] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts prospectus 1968-69* p 2.
[808] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[809] National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1964) Appendix III.
[810] *Ibid.*, para 35.

silversmithing and other metalwork, with theatre design also added by the NCDAD.[811] Students studying within Three Dimensional Design were to be given the opportunity to experiment in a variety of materials, but it was felt important that they specialise as the course progressed.[812]

5.18 The Royal College of Art in the mid-1960s

The 1951 Memorandum and Articles of Association under which the RCA was incorporated as a company limited by guarantee set out the objects of the College's; the first being that 'The College is to provide advanced teaching and to conduct research in the Fine Arts and the principles of art and design in relation to industrial and commercial processes'.[813] By the mid-1960s advanced courses (post-Diploma) had therefore been in existence at the RCA for more then ten years. The School of Furniture was within the Faculty of Industrial Design and the aim of the school was to 'train designers of furniture who will be capable of designing in close co-operation with the technicians and executives upon whom modern factory production depends'.[814] The course details in the prospectus for 1964 are the same as those given for the 1955-6 session; evidently the course had not changed significantly during the previous ten years.

In 1963 College degrees became MA (RCA) and MDes (RCA).[815] The introduction of the Dip A.D, which equalled a university first degree, also equalled the RCA's old diploma qualification, and there was some debate about how the RCA could remain 'advanced' and at the pinnacle of art and design education. Frayling writes that there

811 *Ibid.*, para 43.
812 *Ibid.*, para 43.
813 *RCA Calendar 1957-58* p. 23.
814 *RCA Calendar 1963-64* p. 77.
815 C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p 175.

was a suggestion that the College should offer its own Dip A.D, though this was rejected.[816] In 1963 it was decided that:

> From 1966 onwards the RCA will provide postgraduate courses only. These will normally last three years, and will aim to produce qualified professional artist and industrial designers in certain specialised fields.[817]

The government had first proposed that the RCA concentrate on postgraduate work back in 1910, and fifty-six years later, this had been achieved. The RCA was also affected by recommendations of the government appointed Robbins Committee, which was set up in 1961 to 'review the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain' and to decide on the principles on which long term development of higher education should take place.[818] Art schools were given little attention in the resulting report, probably, as Macdonald points out, due to the work of both the Coldstream and Summerson committees that was taking place at the same time.[819] *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* (the Robbins report), recommended that the RCA be brought under the umbrella of the University Grants Commission, and a following committee recommended that the RCA also be awarded university status and have degree awarding powers.[820] A Royal Charter was granted to the College, and on 11 September 1967 the RCA became a university.[821]

This chapter has examined the changes in art and design education which took place in the twenty years following 1945 and has suggested that the introduction of the Intermediate Certificate and NDD was positive a move following the strong emphasis on drawing and lack of practical work that had been a feature of design education up to the 1930s. The NDD was intended to provide more practical, design focussed, and

---

816 *Ibid.*, p. 175.
817 *Ibid.*, p. 175.
818 Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* (London, 1963) p. 1.
819 S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970) p. 356.
820 *Ibid.*, p. 357. The University Grants Committee was an advisory committee of the government regarding funding awarded to British universities.
821 C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design* (London, 1987) p. 174-5.

industrially relevant courses for students but was not without its critics, however, with complaints that it was perhaps too specialised, whilst industrialists saw it as a teaching qualification. It was replaced with the Dip A.D which was a far less specialised qualification but which, for the first time, gave art schools more freedom to construct courses with either industry or crafts in mind and also gave students more freedom to explore a range of subjects rather than concentrate on one or two specific subjects. The original narrative within this chapter has pieced together for the first time the developments in policy making in art and design education between 1945 and 1960. While this has previously been done in part in relation to specific institutions, this chapter provides the narrative relating to art and design education as a whole.

Chapter six: The end of the art schools: 1967 - 1992

6.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the period 1967 to 1992 and explores the changes to design education up to 1992 when polytechnics became universities. It argues that the period after 1967 saw predominantly external rather than internal changes occurring in art and design education, as art schools were given the freedom to run courses in their own way, tailoring them to arts and crafts or industry as they saw fit. In addition, the introduction of polytechnics led to many art schools finding themselves departments or faculties within larger institutions, which later then became universities. Courses for apprentices and part-time students were phased out of art schools and polytechnic departments during the 1970s as art and design education split into two strands: the more academic and rigorous Dip A.D and BA degree, and the more vocational work done by apprentices which led to City and Guilds qualifications. Also during this period drawing came no longer to be considered a necessary element in all art and design courses, which was a significant change after 130 years of drawing being included in all aspects of art and design education.

This chapter also argues that with the introduction of the Dip A.D the freedom awarded to art schools to set their own curricula and examine their own courses can be regarded both positively and negatively; it was a positive move as it allowed art schools to tailor courses appropriately to the needs of local industries or to concentrate on an area of strength within the art school. For the first time, art schools were able to chose to orient courses in an arts and crafts direction or an industrial direction as they wished. The down side of the freedom awarded to art schools was that even into the 1970s and 1980s there was still a mismatch between what industrialists and employers wanted from art school graduates, and what the students in art schools were being taught, as this chapter demonstrates. Industry was changing, and new materials and technologies were being introduced; the ability to work as part of a team and to be able to communicate well and be flexible was increasingly important, and if art schools did not review and potentially adapt their curricula there was a danger that their courses may not be relevant.

Strand's work covers some of the period of this chapter and gives detailed insight into the policy making and workings of the various councils involved in the introduction and then the end of the Dip A.D. The narrative of art and design education in relation to wider changes in higher education has, in part, had to be pieced together, as Strand's work tends not to focus too much on this; his book is specifically about the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (NCDAD) and the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA).[822]

6.2 The first quinquennial review of the Diploma in Art and Design

By 1968 the numbers of students attending art schools had more than doubled since 1934; in November 1968 there were 111,828 students attending art schools and colleges; this had increased from 54,848 students attending in 1934.[823] These students

[822] R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987).
[823] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 58 (Appendix II).

were studying a variety of courses: full-time Diploma courses, full-time short courses, sandwich, day release, part-time day courses, and evening courses.[824] The vast majority of students appear to have been studying for their own interest and improvement; of the 111,828 students at art schools only 24608, or, roughly a fifth, were recorded as studying for a recognised qualification.[825] The number of students on Dip A.D courses totalled just 6% of students studying for recognised qualifications: in November 1969 there were 6872 students studying for the Dip A.D, and of these, 1293 were doing the Dip A.D in Three Dimensional Design, which was just 1% of the total of art school students.[826] The number of students studying full-time in art schools was still small, and those studying Three Dimensional Design subjects was therefore even smaller. The Minister for Education had stated in 1957 that numbers of full-time students was likely to remain small and the main work of art schools was therefore provision of 'work of other kinds' (courses for part-time and evening students), and it seems that ten years later this was still the case.[827]

The Dip A.D was reviewed by the NCDAD every five years to ensure that courses were meeting the required standards and that art schools had provided the necessary equipment and accommodation for those courses. The first quinquennial review of the Dip A.D, in 1967-8, noted, amongst other issues, that there had been a shortage of suitable applicants for subjects within the Three Dimensional Design (3DD) area during the previous five years. In the 1965-66 academic year 17% of 3DD places were vacant, and in 1966-67, 12% of places remained vacant despite an overall increase in applications.[828] It is not clear why this was the case; it may have been because the students who were applying had either not reached the required level of general education, or their work was not considered up to standard. In spite of the relatively low numbers of students studying for recognised qualifications, the number of students applying for admission to Dip A.D courses was quite high in relation to those actually admitted; around one third of applicants did not gain a place on courses.

---

824 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
825 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
826 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
827 Ministry of Education *Circulars and Administrative Memoranda: issued during the period 1 April 1958 – 31 March 1959* (London, 1959) para. 3.
828 Quinquennial review for 1967 (2nd draft) ED 212/83 (The National Archive).

Year	Total number of applicants	Percentage gaining admission
1965	3644	59.1
1966	4108	56.6
1967	4205	56.1
1968	4384	57.9
1969	4627	54.5[829]

What these figures do not tell us, though, is whether some courses were more popular than others and were over-subscribed, or whether the standard of applicant was too low to be admitted.

Stuart Macdonald notes that by the late 1960s local art colleges were starting to put into practice the recommendations made in the Coldstream report that students should not specialise too much for the Dip A.D, but should be permitted (in the case of 3DD), to 'range over a number of three dimensional subjects' if they wished.[830] This caused some debate, as Macdonald comments; critics observed that the result of a broader education would be 'superficial experimentation together with endless theorizing', while others felt that barriers between art and craft would become irrelevant resulting in an 'abstract 'cultural' education'.[831] As Joyce Storey, member of the Society of Industrial Artists and Designers wrote:

> The breadth of Dip A.D courses can so easily be interpreted as meaning freedom for a student to pursue his own ideas completely uninfluenced by considerations of production methods, economics, and market research and so on. Surely a design student must be made to understand that designing is creativity channelled to a given end, and that it is not sufficient to do a splodge of colour over which he then coos with delight and rapture.[832]

Others were more enthusiastic about the Dip A.D. Strand wrote that:

---

[829] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 62 (Appendix II).
[830] S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970) p. 363.
[831] *Ibid.*, p. 363.
[832] J. Storey Letter in *The Designer*, July 1967 (No 173 p. 13) cited in S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London, 1970) p. 363.

> it could be said that whereas the Intermediate and NDD system had embodied and encouraged primarily a craft-based approach, the coming of the Dip A.D turned the emphasis towards the cerebral and the intellectual.[833]

Diploma courses at Birmingham seem to have allowed their students an amount of freedom for experimentation and creative exploration. The prospectus for the 1969-70 session states that students were encouraged to:

> engage in free fine art activities unhampered by limitations other than those inherent in the creative process….Such activity is not tied to utility or to material, or to techniques.[834]

Leicester's prospectus suggests that their Diploma courses were more structured than those at Birmingham. During the second year 3DD students spent 19 hours a week on their chief study (furniture, ceramics, silversmithing, interior design or industrial design) as well as studying plastics, drawing and fine art, and in the third year they spent 33 hours on their chief study.[835] It seems to have only been in the third year at Leicester that students were given more freedom: the prospectus states that

> The final year will be a period of personal discovery and consolidation. The course will be tailored to suit the individual requirements of each student'.[836]

While the Diploma courses at undergraduate level were fairly broad, courses in design at the RCA were more specific, leading students to specialise in certain areas. The design courses at the RCA for the 1969-70 session led to the M Des (RCA), and the furniture design course consisted of drawing office work, workshop sessions, tutorials, and the study of materials technology and the theory of design as applicable to furniture.[837] Students had to 'make a specialised study of a particular branch of furniture design; or a particular technique of manufacture or a particular theoretical aspect of design'.[838]

---

833 R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 47.
834 *City of Birmingham Polytechnic prospectus 1969-70* pp. 2-4.
835 *City of Leicester Polytechnic prospectus 1969-70* p. 76.
836 *Ibid.*, p. 76.
837 *Royal College of Art Calendar 1969-1970* p. 75.
838 *Ibid.*, p. 75.

6.3 The art schools become polytechnics

While art schools were setting up the Dip A.D and implementing the changes recommended by the Coldstream report and the first report of the NCDAD, changes were taking place across the whole of Higher Education which would affect art and design education. In 1963 the Committee on Higher Education published *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* (the Robbins report).[839] The task of the Committee was to 'review the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain and in the light of national needs and resources to advise Her Majesty's Government on what principles its long-term development should be based'.[840] The report concentrated mainly on universities and colleges which provided 'courses for the education and training of teachers or systematic courses of further education beyond the Advanced Level of the General Certificate of Education or beyond the Ordinary National Certificate or its equivalent'.[841]

Art schools and colleges were thus included in the report's considerations, and the Robbins report recognised that many of the courses offered in these colleges were at, or near, university standard, and therefore universities were no longer the sole providers of degree-level higher education.[842] The Robbins Committee took as its starting point the view that 'courses of higher education should be available for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them and who wish to do so'.[843] This could be achieved via a number of various institutions and courses, which would have differing functions and emphases, but these different functions and emphases did not mean that one institution was more important or valuable than another.[844]

---

[839] Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* (1963) HC 2154.
[840] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[841] *Ibid.*, p. 1
[842] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[843] *Ibid.*, p. 5, 8-9.
[844] *Ibid.*, p. 5, 8-9.

In 1962-3 there were 216,000 students in full-time higher education. The Robbins report anticipated the need for 560,000 places for students by 1980; this was to be achieved through an expansion of the universities and teacher training colleges.[845] Art schools were to continue as they were, with some developing into regional colleges, and the Dip A.D was to continue to be awarded.[846] One final development as a result of the Robbins report was that the RCA was awarded a Royal Charter and took on University status in 1967. Following the 1963 Robbins report, the Government's white paper *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges* was published in 1966. According to Tight, the Government recognised that there was a need to continue to support technical, commercial and art colleges which had been developing through the 1950s and 1960s 'without prejudicing opportunities for the tens of thousands of less advanced students who wish to take courses at intermediate and lower levels'.[847] The Government's solution to this need was to develop a new, distinct sector within further and higher education - polytechnic education – which would be able to offer both intermediate and degree level courses, in contrast to universities which tended to only offer degree level courses.[848] The proposal was that some colleges and other major institutions be designated polytechnics; these would be the 'main centres for the future development of full-time higher education within the Further Education system'.[849] As the Robbins report had already noted, many of these institutions were already offering university-level courses – such as the Dip A.D, for example - and the intention was that they would continue to do this, with an emphasis on applied and vocational study.[850] Although *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges* was rather brief – amounting to only ten pages, Robinson, writing in 1968, noted that the effect of the policy would be huge: 'Thirty polytechnics are to be formed by the amalgamation of some 68 colleges including 36 colleges of technology, 18 colleges of art, ten colleges of commerce and

[845] *Ibid.,* p. 284.
[846] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[847] M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 70 & Department of Education and Science *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: Higher Education in the Further Education System* (1966) HC 3006, p. 3 para. 3.
[848] Department of Education and Science *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: Higher Education in the Further Education System* (1966) HC 3006, p. 9 para. 28 (ii).
[849] *Ibid.*, p. 9 para. 28 (ii).
[850] M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 70.

four specialist colleges'.[851] The NCDAD was not happy about the Government's proposal, feeling that the inclusion of art schools into polytechnics would be disadvantageous to art and design education, as, 'for the most part, their total role beside that of commerce and technology would be a relatively minor one'.[852] The NCDAD proposed a federated system of art and design education, where art schools could maintain their autonomy and individuality, yet form closer links with technical colleges, or merge with them to become polytechnics if they desired; any inclusion would be voluntary on the part of the art school.[853] The NCDAD's views were not acted upon, however, and the polytechnic scheme went ahead.

While there may have been concerns that art schools were going to be subsumed into large polytechnics and their individuality lost, in the case of larger art schools, such as Birmingham and Leicester, their size and status was a positive thing. As Strand notes:

> We need of course to remember that in several cases, notably in Birmingham, Leicester and Manchester, the colleges of art which were to be constituent parts of the new institutions were at that time conducting more high level, degree equivalent courses than the neighbouring technical and other establishments which in terms of student members were the larger partners. Thus these colleges of art, at least, entered the polytechnics in a position of some strength and were well able to hold their own.[854]

As a result of the Government's White Paper Birmingham education authority was 'invited to prepare a scheme for the establishment of a Polytechnic taking account of the existing provision for advanced technical education in the City and the work of the College of Commerce and the College of Art and Design'.[855] The authority evidently took up the invitation, and two years later in 1971 the City of Birmingham Polytechnic

---

[851] E. Robinson *The New Polytechnics* (London, 1968) p. 92, Cited in M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 103.
[852] Letter by Sir William Coldstream published in *The Times* on 24 June 1967, Cited in R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 62. William Coldstream was chair of the NACAEd.
[853] R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 62.
[854] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[855] Department of Education and Science *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: Higher Education in the Further Education System* (1966) HC 3006, p. 10.

was established.[856] Birmingham's art school was incorporated into the Polytechnic as the Art and Design Centre and kept its four faculties of Graphic Design, Three Dimensional Design, Textile/Fashion and Fine Art, as it had previously had, corresponding to the recommendations in the Coldstream report of 1960. Students within the School of Furniture in the Faculty of Industrial Design could either take the Dip A.D or City and Guilds courses. The prospectus for 1970-71 states that:

> Whilst pursuing the major specialisation of furniture…students will have the opportunity of working in fully equipped wood-working machine shops to produce working prototypes and scale models. Every encouragement will be given for an active involvement in the development of new materials and processes both in the school workshops and in the adjacent engineering workshops.[857]

Leicester's case was rather more straightforward than that of Birmingham: the White Paper had recommended that the College of Art and the Regional College of Technology should merge, and the two became the City of Leicester Polytechnic on 1 April 1969. As noted previously through this thesis the two colleges had a long history of co-operation and sharing resources, and as the prospectus for the 1969-70 session states, 'The Polytechnic is well placed to build on the long traditions of high standards that were characteristics of the Colleges of Art and Technology'.[858] A wide range of courses were offered by the institution:

> Full-time and sandwich courses are provided for a wide range of London University and Council for National Academic Awards Degrees at Honours and Ordinary levels. There is also a wide range of Higher National and Polytechnic Diploma and Certificate full-time, sandwich and part-time courses, as well as courses for a variety of professional qualifications.[859]

Such a wide range of available courses was perhaps not surprising: art schools had been catering for a wide range of students – from intending designers studying full time to those attending art school purely for pleasure – and it seems polytechnics, initially at least, were to continue to provide courses for these students. Within art and design at

---

[856] M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 33.
[857] *City of Birmingham Polytechnic prospectus 1970-71* p. 44.
[858] *City of Leicester Polytechnic Prospectus of full-time courses 1969-70* p 6.
[859] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Leicester Polytechnic there was 'a wide range of Diploma in Art and Design and Polytechnic Diploma courses, and a Pre-diploma course'.[860]

Regarding art and design, Leicester Polytechnic recognised that design for industry was now increasingly important 'as the problems of form, technique, and appearance emerge as major factors in volume manufacturing and marketing'.[861] The prospectus goes on to state that 'The designer is not only responsible for the functional and visual qualities of the product but also makes an important contribution in the development and direction of the overall concept of mass produced units'.[862] Leicester Dip A.D curriculum had not altered much since it was introduced for the 1963-4 session, though the 1969-70 prospectus does give a little more detail about what students were to learn. During their first year, 3DD Diploma students spent five hours a week learning about 'Design for Constructions in Wood' which included constructional design; laminating and bending; machine forms using hand power tools and simple machines; wood finishes; the structural values of materials; colour, texture and shape; three dimensional form.[863] The first year of the course was fairly broad and gave students an introduction to working in wood, metals or ceramics; at the start of the second year students chose their chief study and began to specialise more, in a change from 1963-4 when students had to wait until their final year before specialising in one subject. Drawing was still a large part of the course, but had become rather more technical, and under the heading of 'Drawing Office Practice', students were taught Orthographic projection, Isometric and Axonometric Projections, Development Drawing, Production Drawing, Drawing Office Procedure, Presentation Drawing, Freehand Perspective Drawing, Water Colour Rendering, Two Point Measured Perspective, Gouache Rendering, and Three Point Measured Perspective.[864] Plastics technology was also not introduced until the second year; students studied this for approximately four hours per week plus any additional time required by the chief study.[865] The study of plastics had been introduced to furniture courses at Leicester in the 1963-4 session, when the Dip A.D course was

[860] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[861] *Ibid.*, p. 75-6.
[862] *Ibid.*, p. 75-6.
[863] *Ibid.*, p. 77.
[864] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[865] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

brought in. Previously, courses in cabinet making and furniture had concentrated on design in wood and not included plastics in their curricula, but during the 1960s, as the use of plastics in furniture increased, there was a need to bring this element into furniture courses.

Sparke writes that 'The 1960s was the decade in which plastics finally came into their own, and this was as apparent in furniture as in other things'; while this may have been the case, as Edwards notes, plastics were already used within furniture manufacture in a wide variety of ways: 'construction, finishing, gluing, upholstery covers and fillings, fittings, and accessories, such as handles and applied decoration'.[866] Some varieties of plastic had already begun to be used in the furniture industry during the post-war period: Charles Eames had produced a moulded glass-fibre reinforced plastic chair in 1948; Eero Saarinen had designed a moulded plastic chair for Knoll in 1957, and Arne Jacobsen designed his glass reinforced plastic 'Egg' chair in 1958.[867] It wasn't until the post-war period though, that, according to Edwards, manufacturers became interested in using plastics in Britain, and then laminates were one of the earliest uses of plastics in furniture, a use which was both successful and consistent according to Edwards, possibly because the laminating process was similar to veneering and was familiar to the furniture industry.[868] In 1963 Robin Day's hugely popular *Poly* side chair first appeared on the UK market, manufactured for furniture company Hille International.[869] The *Poly* was made from injection moulded plastic, the first time such technology had been used for making chairs, and Day had worked in conjunction with Shell petrochemical company to develop the material for his chair.[870] Polyurethane foam was also made more rigid and used for upholstery, and polystyrene grains were used in the

[866] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) pp. 92 & 82 & C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, manufacture and markets* (Manchester, 1994) p. 22-3.
[867] C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, manufacture and markets* (Manchester, 1994) p. 23 & P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 92.
[868] C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, manufacture and markets* (Manchester, 1994) p 23-4.
[869] http://www.designmuseum.org/design/robin-lucienne-day - accessed 25/9/9. Charles and Ray Eames had produced the first mass produced plastic chairs with their 'Eames Plastic Side Chairs' range in the early 50s, however this was in the US, and this thesis is concentrating on the UK furniture market.
[870] http://www.hille.co.uk/polyside-history - accessed 13/1/15.

Sacco chair in 1969, and in bean-bags everywhere since.[871] As Edwards notes 'The range and number of applications in furniture-making were growing and now included chair shells, drawer and wardrobe fitments, decorative laminates, foam upholstery, fabrics, fittings, finishes and adhesives'.[872] It seemed that plastics were to be the future in furniture manufacturing, but by the early 1970s the world oil crisis had resulted in plastics becoming prohibitively expensive, and furniture manufacturers returned to wood and other more traditional materials.[873] Given the wide use of plastics within the furniture industry, it was necessary that students at art schools receive some training in their use and applications, and it appears Leicester's art school was willing to offer this training to their students. The mention of 'new materials and processes' in Birmingham's prospectus suggests that they too were offering more relevant training to their students.[874]

In a 1965 paper given to the Royal Society of Arts, Misha Black stated that 'Furniture is posed at a moment of transformation'.[875] He was referring to the association between art and craft that had long existed within art schools, and, regarding the training of industrial designers, noted that furniture, along with industrial design for the engineering industries, presented its own particular problems. As Black noted;

> The immediate special problems of these….fields of industrial design indicate trends which may eventually require a revaluation of even those other aspects of industrial design which, for the time being, fit satisfactorily into the art and crafts structure of the majority of our schools.[876]

As he commented: 'For the present, we can generally accept the arts/crafts school structure in Britain as it is, but if more industries, which are traditionally craft-based, move towards the kind of automation which now characterises the engineering

---

[871] C. Edwards *Twentieth Century Furniture: Materials, manufacture and markets* (Manchester, 1994) p. 25.
[872] *Ibid*., p. 25.
[873] P. Sparke *Furniture* (London, 1986) p. 82.
[874] *City of Birmingham Polytechnic prospectus 1970-71* p. 44.
[875] M. Black 'The Education of Industrial Designers I: Past and Present' *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* 113:5111 (1965 Oct.) pp. 850-882.
[876] *Ibid*., pp. 850-882.

industries, and is affecting the furniture industry, then the type of education which typifies even the best schools may no longer universally appropriate'.[877]
Black saw furniture moving 'rapidly into the camp of anonymous objects such as telephones, sewing machines and operating tables in which utility becomes so dominant as to create its own forms which are less influenced by the dictates of fashion'.[878] As he noted: 'To the extent that furniture design becomes influenced by the factors which condition design for the engineering industries, so will it become more divorced from its craft roots, and the training of the furniture designers will consequently become differently orientated'.[879] Black's words were not misplaced: furniture design courses became increasingly more linked to industrial design and engineering. Indeed, his comment that 'Furniture is posed at a moment of transformation' would perhaps not even have been out of place during the 1930s, when sections of the furniture industry had become mechanised and the authors of the *Design and the Designer in Industry* report anticipated a greater need for the use of machinery and technical processes to be taken into account during students' training.

6.4 The Second Coldstream report

Towards the end of the 1960s the NCDAD thought that some aspects of the Dip A.D system should be reviewed and set up a working group in May 1968 to start this process. Around the same time the NACAEd had been looking to review aspects of vocational education in art and design - possibly as a result of the Robbins Report - but thought this would be more effectively done if it was related to the whole system of art and design education. There had also been unrest at some art colleges around the country with opinions expressed that art education needed to change, and this gave added impetus to the desire for a review of art and design education as a whole.[880] A public

[877] *Ibid.*, pp. 850-882
[878] *Ibid.*, pp. 850-882.
[879] *Ibid.*, pp. 850-882.
[880] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 2. On 28 May 1968, as 24 hour sit-in began at Hornsey College of Art, over a dispute between

invitation was issued by the NACAEd for 'the submission of views on any matters relating to the general structure of art and design education in colleges and schools of art', indicating that the Council were aware of feelings expressed about art and design education and wanted to take these into account in their review.[881] As several members of the NACAEd's review committee were also on the NCDAD, it was felt that the two Councils should come together to jointly review art and design education. To this end the joint committee of the NCDAD and NACAEd was set up in October 1968, and in 1970 the two bodies published their report *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector* (the Second Coldstream report).[882] Sir William Coldstream, chairman of the NACAEd, was chair of the joint committee and all other members of the Committee were either from the NCDAD or the NACAEd, including John Summerson, chairman of the NCDAD; Misha Black; Robin Darwin; Meredith Hawes from Birmingham's art school; Nikolaus Pevsner, and Robert Strand, deputy chief officer of the NCDAD, and later registrar for Art and Design on the Council for National Academic Awards.

The aim of the committee was to review the structure of art and design education and recommend any changes to be made to the system as a whole. Following their invitation for submissions of opinion on art and design education, 141 responses were received from various groups, organisations and individuals. The committee noted that while opinion had been expressed on several aspects of art and design education, and in spite of the unrest seen in some art schools, 'the evidence presented to us fell far short of a widespread condemnation of the total pattern as it has developed over the last decade'.[883]

---

the student union and the college management over funds for the union. What had initially been intended as a short sit-in turned into a 6 week protest as other grievances about entrance requirements for courses, facilities at the college and art and design education more generally began to be aired. The unrest spread to other art colleges such as Guildford, Nottingham, Brighton and Birmingham, and a 1969 Select Committee on Education and Science noted that the majority of criticisms were leveled at the Dip A.D as a qualification. See R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) chapter 7.

[881] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 2.

[882] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[883] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

At the time of *The Structure of Art and Design Education etc.,* report, there were 142 'art establishments' in England and Wales; 68 of these were individual art colleges while the rest were departments of art and design in larger educational establishments, or had been (or were proposed to be) absorbed into polytechnics. Forty colleges were approved to run the Dip A.D, including 17 which either were or would soon become, incorporated into a polytechnic; between them these colleges and art departments ran 164 Dip A.D courses.[884] As the report noted: 'Art and design education in further education is a complex work which includes courses of various levels and intended for students having a wide variety of educational backgrounds and ambitions'.[885] Not all art colleges or departments offered courses for every type of student, but the joint committee listed the various courses available across art and design education as a whole. The full-time courses available were:

Post Diploma courses

Dip A.D courses

Higher National Diploma courses

Vocational courses recruiting at age 18 or higher

Vocational courses recruiting at age 16 or 17

Foundation courses (one or two year)

Preliminary courses in art for students too young to start a foundation course

One-year courses associated with industry and leading to apprenticeships.[886]

Part-time options available were:

Part-time day / evening release or block release courses for those in industry

Courses leading to GCE examinations in art and craft subjects

Non-vocational courses 'to serve the interests and recreational needs of the local community'.[887]

---

[884] *Ibid.*, p. 4 & R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 41.

[885] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p 4.

[886] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

In total then, art schools and colleges were offering eleven different types of course to eleven different types of student. When the government school of design was founded in 1837, the school catered almost immediately for different groups of students; those wishing to train full time so that they could pursue a career in the arts, those attending during the day purely for their own pleasure, and those attending in the evenings in order that some art education might benefit their work. Art and design education therefore had a long history of catering for the differing requirements of its many students, though with the expansion of higher and further education in the 1960s, it was perhaps becoming more difficult to sustain within one institution or department within an institution.

6.5 The structure of the Diploma is changed

The Structure of Art and Design Education etc., report recommended that the Dip A.D courses should be split into two streams: the first (Group A courses) would see the continuation of the range of courses already in existence but allow for more flexibility in approach, while the second stream (Group B courses) would be 'directed more specifically towards certain categories of industrial and professional design practice'.[888] For students following courses within Group A, the subject areas of Fine Art, Graphic Design, Fashion / Textiles and Three Dimensional Design (3DD) would remain, and within the first three areas students would be able to move more freely between subjects of study rather than be confined to one rigid area of chief studies, so a student who primarily studied painting could also experiment with sculpture if they wished.[889] The final area of study, 3DD, was the exception to this recommendation. The committee though that the concept of chief studies should be retained in this area as not every art department or college offered every subject within 3DD, and neither was it practical for them to do so; many of the subjects required expensive equipment / materials and it

[887] *Ibid.,* p. 4.
[888] *Ibid.,* p. 7.
[889] *Ibid.,* p. 7

would be uneconomic and inefficient to expect every art department or college to have all the necessary equipment for each subject. Although the committee wanted chief studies to be retained for 3DD, students should be able to do a certain amount of work in other subjects where practicable.[890]

The joint committee proposed that Group B courses would then be those 'which can best be studied in close association with the relevant industry or profession by including within the course a period of industrial or professional experience'.[891] What the committee was essentially proposing were sandwich courses, with the period in industry lasting no less than three and no more than twelve months. This sandwich period was to be considered an integral, rather than an additional part of the course, and was to be supervised by the college to ensure that the two parts of the course (industrial and within the college) were complementary.[892] Courses were to be included within Group B on the basis of their scientific, technological or professional content together with the need for a period of sandwich training. The joint committee felt that it would not be possible to complete Group B courses within three years, so, including the sandwich element, these courses were proposed to be four years in length.[893] Previously, Dip A.D students had been encouraged to spend time in industry during the holidays, with the only compulsory element a four-week period prior to the start of the final year, and it is not clear if this was a compulsory element of the Dip A.D course itself, or if individual art schools introduced the compulsory period in industry.[894] The split of the Dip A.D into group A and group B courses was perhaps a recognition that the early years of the Diploma (1963/4 – 1970) may not have provided adequate training for students wishing to enter industry. The fact that the qualification was fairly broad, certainly within 3DD, meant that 'students in this area may eventually be employed in industry or they may choose to work as studio craftsmen or become teachers', and may not have been as successful as was intended.[895]

---

[890] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[891] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[892] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[893] *Ibid.*, p. 9-10.
[894] *Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design Prospectus 1963-64.* p. 38.
[895] Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (London, 1960) p. 7.

One other recommendation of *The Structure of Art and Design Education* etc., was that for the first time since 1837 when the government set up the first School of Design, fine art training was no longer considered necessary for all students. As the joint committee noted, the *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* (the Coldstream report of 1960) envisaged that all Dip A.D students would have some fine art training, regardless of their eventual aim in terms of employment. However, the joint committee of 1970 thought that:

> In the meanwhile we believe that art and design education has evolved in such a way as to make the concept not universally appropriate. We now would not regard the study of fine art as necessarily central to all studies in the design field.[896]

It is not clear what the joint committee meant when then talked about 'the study of fine art'. Presumably they were referring to painting, and also drawing in the sense of still life or figure drawing, which is what one tends to think of as being termed 'fine art'. Previously the study of fine art had become almost a stumbling block in the training of designers. The 1835-6 Select Committee had recommended that art school students be given 'not mere theoretical instruction only, but the direct application of art to manufactures'; however this had not happened and students were instead instructed in drawing, shading, colouring and painting; drawing, which included anatomical studies, figure drawing, human, animal and plant forms, as well as drawing from casts, and this remained the primary means for instruction in design through the late 1800s and into the 1900s.[897] The components included in the National Course of Instruction as set out by Cole and Redgrave had a definite fine art orientation to them. The Hambleden report of 1936 noted that a designer should first and foremost be an artist, and that their 'essential qualification must be ability to draw', and even with the introduction of the NDD and Dip A.D and much more practical work, drawing was still seen as an essential

---

[896] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 12.

[897] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the minutes of evidence, appendix and index* (1836) HC 568, p. v.

component of courses.[898] The recommendation of the Second Coldstream report that fine art should no longer be an *essential* element of design courses was an important change, ending 130 years of drawing as a compulsory or essential element of design education.

6.6 *The Employment of Art College Leavers* survey

The Structure of Art and Design Education etc., report considered that one issue which needed to be addressed was the way in which art and design education was evaluated. As the committee noted, one way of doing this was to take account of the employment prospects of students completing courses though at that time there was 'little available information to show how well the output of the art colleges meets the need for qualified people'.[899] Art school prospectuses did sometimes note where their former students were now employed; for example Birmingham art school's prospectus for 1969-70 noted that students from the School of Furniture had gone on to work in architects offices, interior design studios and staff positions within the furniture industry, but this information was not routinely provided by art schools, nor was it particularly specific.[900] The joint committee had requested that a survey be undertaken to discover whether art and design education was meeting the needs of industry, and the Government Social Survey Department was commissioned to undertake a survey of the current employment of people who had taken courses in art and design. The sample chosen for the survey was 'all those who had left the final year of a full-time art or design course lasting two years or more (excluding foundation courses) from any art

[898] Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry* (London, 1937) p. 30 & Board of Education, *Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London* (London, 1936) p. 27. ED 136/626 (The National Archive).
[899] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 41.
[900] *City of Birmingham Polytechnic prospectus 1969-70* p. 44.

college or art department in England and Wales during the academic year 1967-1968…'[901]

The survey was concerned with students who had left a course in art and design, not just those who had graduated from a course, so included those who left due to dropping out part way through, or those who completed, but did not pass their courses.[902] The survey was carried out in 1970 and the completed report, *The Employment of Art College Leavers* was published in 1972.[903] As Strand notes, it was the first survey of its kind on the subject of art and design.[904] The general aim of the survey was noted as twofold: 'firstly to investigate the employment situation during the first twenty months after leaving an art or design course for all students who left such courses in one particular year; and secondly, to see what could be discovered about the requirements of commerce, industry and the professional world for recently trained artists and designers'.[905]

The courses involved in the study were the Dip A.D, post grad / post Dip A.D courses, and vocational courses, but students who had taken art teachers' diplomas or certificates were excluded from the study.[906] Although the RCA was an independent college and not maintained by a Local Education Authority, it was included in the study because of the post-grad and post Diploma work it carried out. Around 5,000 students were eligible to be included in the survey and the authors of the report decided to approach all of them rather than choose a sample of certain art colleges and/or art departments for their study, as there was variation in courses between different regions, and between colleges within the same region.[907] Of relevance to this thesis were the 1798 people who had left

---

[901] J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 2.
[902] *Ibid*., p. 2
[903] Ritchie, J *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* London: HMSO, 1972.
[904] R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 100.
[905] J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 1.
[906] *Ibid*., p. 216.
[907] J *Ibid.*, p. 215.

a Dip A.D course in 1968; of these, 294 had taken a course in 3DD.[908] All the ex-students were contacted by post, and from those who responded (63% of all students contacted) some were selected randomly to be interviewed about their experiences of art schools.[909] The numbers of students who studied Furniture Design or Industrial Design was very small, as can be seen from the figures below:

Number of leavers from within each course in 1968

	Post grad	Dip A.D	Vocational
Furniture Design	12 (5%)	36 (3%)	14 (1%)
Industrial Design (product)	12 (5%)	36 (3%)	14 (1%)
Total leavers	234 (100%)	1198 (100%)	1356 (100%)[910]

The number of students leaving a Dip A.D course in Furniture Design does seem very small – 36 students across the whole country – but, as noted at the start of this chapter, numbers of students undertaking the Dip A.D were relatively small in comparison to the total number of students at art and design colleges. In 1969, 6782 students were studying for a Dip A.D, with 1298 students taking the Dip A.D in 3DD.[911] Given that these were students in all years of the Diploma course and that there were a number of subjects within 3DD, it is perhaps unsurprising that the number of students in the final year of one subject within 3DD is small. Additionally, not all art departments or all art schools would have been approved for 3DD, and in those that were approved for 3DD work, furniture design and industrial design would not have been approved in all of them.

[908] *Ibid.*, p. 216. The figures do not give the breakdown of individual subjects within post-grad and post-Diploma courses.
[909] *Ibid.*, p. 221.
[910] *Ibid.*, p. 11. Figures are included within a wider table of percentages. Numbers in the original table are given as percentages but for ease of understanding have been converted into figures. As these figures initially worked out as 11.7, 35.94 and 13.65 they have been rounded up to the nearest whole number (or person).
[911] Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* (London, 1970) p. 60 (Appendix II).

The Employment of Art College Leavers also conducted interviews with some respondents regarding their experiences of finding work after they left art school. One furniture design ex-student who had taken the Dip A.D made the following comment:

> I suppose I had chosen a field of study in which more people were being trained than needed. Well, the fact that there are about 200 qualified furniture designers entering the employment field and only about a dozen jobs in this field are advertised annually. It seems obvious that there are more trained people than positions available.[912]

David Douglas, Marquess of Queensbury and Professor of Ceramics at the RCA commented on the same point in a 1975 paper given to the RSA when he asked; 'If we know the number of openings for textile designers is X, is it sensible to train two or three times X numbers of people?'[913] Whilst the pay and conditions of designers in industry was still an issues – especially compared to teaching which was better paid and had longer holidays, there also had to be more contact between industry and art schools, especially in giving students the opportunity to gain industrial experience during their course.[914] As Douglas noted of design managers within companies:

> They are also in the position to offer students employment during the holidays to excite them with the opportunities that exist for creative and imaginative work. If they cannot do this they have only themselves to blame if they are unable to attract people with real talent.[915]

Students themselves were concerned about the lack of contact with industry during their training. Only one third of leavers said they had had industrial or commercial experience as part of their course; 16% said they had not any experience in industry during their course but had arranged some for their vacations, and half of the students said they had had no experience at all.[916] Evidently then, pre 1970, when the Dip A.D was split into Group A and Group B courses and a period in industry was supposedly compulsory, students did not necessarily get the chance to spend time in industry. Both

---

[912] J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 99.
[913] D. Douglas, Marquess of Queensbury 'The Designer, The Craftsman and the Manufacturer' in *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* 124:5234 (1976: Jan) pp. 87-96.
[914] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-96.
[915] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-96.
[916] J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 144.

Birmingham and Leicester claimed to offer this opportunity to their students, but from the statements of the students it would seem that this was the exception rather than the rule. The length of the industrial or commercial experience varied, as did the tasks the ex-students had done, but almost all of the students said they found it useful as it gave them a realistic idea of what went on in industry, what sort of work they would be expected to do, how things were organised, and what sort of deadlines and pressures they would have to face.[917] As one 3DD ex-student commented, 'I think it was helpful to stretch your perspective to the end product'.[918] One ex-post-grad of 3DD made the point that:

> You can't gain experience by design education. We had professional practice lecturers who showed us how a job should be run, but it is only the theoretical side. In practice things don't run according to theory all the time. It's something a course can't give you.[919]

Ex-students also commented on how useful gaining technical knowledge in industry was. One noted that 'It showed me better than any college could have how the work was actually carried out', while another ex-student commented that 'It also showed me something that college didn't show me – i.e. how money biased everything is in design'.[920]

Leicester's prospectuses from 1966 onwards state that an industrial placement was part of the Dip A.D course, and this seems to have carried when the Dip A.D became the BA degree. The prospectus states that:

> In addition to the School's facilities, students are encouraged…to seek out relevant information from any source. To this end, visits are arranged for specific study as components of the course. These are considered essential to the full development of the student.[921]

An industrial placement had been part of Birmingham's NDD and Dip A.D courses and it is unclear whether this continued with BA degree. Even though industrial experience was recommended by the joint NCDAD and NACAEd committee, it does not seem to

---

[917] *Ibid.*, p. 144-5.
[918] *Ibid.*, p. 146.
[919] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[920] *Ibid.*, p. 147.
[921] *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus 1975-1976* p. 24.

have been integrated by the art schools into their courses, at least that can be seen in prospectuses. It may have been that it was difficult to find firms in the locality who were willing to take on students for a period of time on a regular basis, and it may also have been that case that firms did not want to give a student experience of their processes and ways of working – there was an element of not wanting to share 'company secrets' - if that student was then going to go and potentially work for a rival firm upon graduation.

Strand notes that one of the outcomes of the survey, and probably the most important for those who had been on the Coldstream and Summerson committees, was that it showed that a high proportion of those leaving art school in 1968 had found work in jobs and professions directly in, or related to, their field of study.[922] Strand writes;

> Indeed, at the time of the survey, taken in 1970, three-quarters of all the 1968 leavers were in activities connected with art or design (as defined, it is true, by the leavers themselves). It appeared even possible that they fared as well as if not better than their confreres who had studied socially and professionally more 'respectable' subjects in universities.[923]

This was vindication for those who had introduced the Dip A.D and the concept of a liberal education in art and design, without as Strand notes, a student then necessarily going on to work in a similar field.[924] In spite of this though, it was clear that most students who had undertaken a course in art and design *did* then go on to work in the same or a directly related field. Although students were evidently finding jobs in art and design upon leaving art school, employers still had concerns about what they were being taught on their courses.

6.7 Interviews with employers

As well as interviewing ex-students of art and design courses, *The Employment of Art College Leavers* also surveyed all firms and organisations that had employed the leavers

[922] R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982* (London, 1987) p. 101.
[923] *Ibid.*, p. 101.
[924] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

in an art or design capacity in the two years since they had left their courses in 1968.[925] In all, just over 1800 firms and organisations were contacted and 62% of them (1116 firms) responded. It was down to the ex-students to state whether they thought they had been employed in an art or design capacity by the firm, so the range of firms and organisations was selective in that respect, and did not necessarily represent actual or potential employers of art and design graduates.[926]

As well as being asked more specific questions about the skills their employees possessed, the firms were also asked general questions about the numbers of people employed in an art or design capacity. 30% of firms stated that the number of designers or artists they employed had increased in the last three years; 14% stated that the number had decreased, and 46% said there had been no change.[927] Employers were also asked how changes occurring within their industrial or commercial field would affect the nature of the work designers would do. Respondents anticipated three developments of this nature: first were changes which would entail designers requiring different skills and new approaches; second, employers felt that the standard of design was rising and students would need to be aware of this when entering industry; and third, more specific skills such as photography, an awareness of new materials, and the use of film and television were cited as needs of the future.[928]

6.8 Furniture manufacturers' views

Within the furniture industry, thirty-three firms that employed designers responded to the survey; 12% of them (four firms) gave the expansion of their business as a reason for employing more designers, while 15% (five firms) said that more design work was being done and the design department was being expanded, hence the need for more

[925] J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p 158.
[926] *Ibid.*, p. 158.
[927] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[928] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

designers.[929] In terms of changes affecting the type of work furniture designers would do, 6% (two firms) thought that designers would need more technical or scientific knowledge, while 15% (five firms) thought that designers would need additional skills such as business methods and an ability to communicate.[930] 6% (two firms) also thought that the standard of design was rising and more design awareness generally was required.[931] 15% (five firms) noted that the introduction of new materials would increase scope for design, and designers would need to be aware of these materials.[932]

Employers' views were also sought as to whether the training received in art schools 'appeared to meet the requirements of their own organisations'.[933] Employers were asked the question: 'Thinking of the art college leavers who have applied to you in the last two years, what are your impressions of the work these people have done at art college, *bearing in mind your particular requirements within this establishment*?'[934] Employers were asked to answer with reference to basic art and design skills (drawing, surface pattern skills, proportion, letter forms, ability to design in three dimensions, and so on); technical knowledge and its application; relevance of studies to commercial or industrial practice; originality and creativity.[935] The question was asked of 689 firms and organisations that had received several applications from art college leavers over the previous two years and who had employed at least one leaver during those two years.[936] Twenty-eight furniture companies responded to the question, and their impressions of the abilities of art college leavers are on the following page:

[929] *Ibid.*, p. 180.
[930] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[931] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[932] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[933] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[934] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[935] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[936] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

Furniture manufacturers' impressions of work done by recent applicants at art college, by skill / knowledge grouping.[937]

General rating	Basic design skills	Tech knowledge and application	Relevance of studies to commercial / industrial practice	Originality / creativity
Good / very good / fairly good / sound / very adequate	29% (8 firms)	14% (4 firms)	-	25% (7 firms)
Fair / adequate / moderate / acceptable satisfactory / reasonable	14% (4 firms)	29% (8 firms)	11% (3 firms)	21% (6 firms)
Poor / lacking / inadequate / low / disappointing	11% (3 firms)	18% (5 firms)	29% (8 firms)	11% (3 firms)
None / non existent	-	4% (1 firm)	7% (2 firms)	4% (1 firm)
Varies according to college / course	-	-	4% (1 firm)	4% (1 firm)
Mixture – good in some ways, bad in others	14% (4 firms)	-		-
No overall rating / no comment made	32% (9 firms)	36% (10 firms)	50% (14 firms)	36% (10 firms)
	100% (28 firms)	101% (28 firms)	101% (28 firms)	101% (28 firms)

[937] All figures taken from industry tables in J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p 188-194.

Employers were also asked if they wished to make any additional comments on the training of students; seven of the 18 furniture firms that responded to the survey felt that the work of leavers was not suitable for commercial or industrial practice and further training was required.[938]

It was not just the furniture firms who felt that the work of students was not particularly relevant to industry; the need for designers to have technological and scientific skills in order to keep up with changes in technology and materials was mentioned frequently in the survey, as was the need for designers to play a part in the business as a whole, beyond the design office or department.[939] The most criticised aspect of design education was the relevance of students' studies to commercial and industrial practice; industrialists and businessmen criticised courses for being too theoretical and not geared to the workplace and the structure and specialisation of courses was not appropriate to present industrial needs.[940] Employers also thought that students were not sufficiently aware of the time demands of industry, or of pressures of costing that were a factor in industry.[941]

6.9 Diplomas become bachelor's degrees

After the establishment of the polytechnics, Dip A.D courses were still overseen by the NCDAD, but it became apparent to many that the logical progression was that the NCDAD would become part of the Council for National Academic Awards, the awarding body for non-art and design polytechnic courses. As Strand writes, 'As for the CNAA and the NCDAD, since about half of all the Dip A.D students were, or shortly would be, in polytechnics, there was a reasonable case for the two validating bodies themselves to merge'.[942] Having two different validating bodies for different courses

---

938 J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 195.
939 *Ibid.*, p. 179.
940 *Ibid.*, p. 191.
941 *Ibid.*, p. 191.
942 R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960 - 1982* (London, 1987) p. 140.

running in the same institution was becoming problematic, and some art and design courses had started drawing on the teaching from other courses outside art and design and not validated by the NCDAD, which gave further weight to the opinion that the two bodies should merge.[943] After several meetings between the councils of the NCDAD and the CNAA, it was announced towards the end of 1972 that the two bodies would merge and the organisation would continue to be known as the CNAA.[944] In a statement of intent issued by the two bodies in 1973, they stated that among other proposals, 'students following a degree level course should be awarded a degree rather than a diploma'.[945] Within the CNAA a Board of Studies for Art and Design would be set up, similar to existing Boards of Studies for Education, Arts and Social Studies, Science and Technology and Research Degrees. The Dip A.D would also become either a BA or BSc degree.[946] On 1 September 1974 the NCDAD was merged into the CNAA, and the Dip A.D began to be phased out and replaced by an Honours Bachelors degree.[947] Strand notes that some within the CNAA were sceptical of the merger and the decision to award BA or BSc degrees in place of the Dip A.D as they had doubts about the 'academic respectability' and 'degree-worthiness' of art and design.[948] After over a hundred years of being separate from the rest of the education system, operating in a system of art schools and overseen directly by government, art and design education was now fully under the umbrella of higher education and, in the main, part of larger institutions which all offered degrees to students.

The BA Hons in Furniture Design was introduced at the City of Leicester Polytechnic in 1975. The prospectus gives general information about the Faculty of Industrial Design (under which Furniture was housed), stating that:

> The affiliation of five areas in three-dimensional design offers wide scope to creative people….Furniture Design may be concerned with large-scale contract

943 *Ibid.*, p. 141.
944 *Ibid.*, p. 142.
945 *Amalgamation of CNAA and NCDAD Statement to all interested parties* in R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960 -1982* (London, 1987) p. 143.
946 *Ibid.*, p. 143.
947 *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* London: Design Council, 1977. p. 11.
948 R. Strand *A good deal of freedom: Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960 - 1982* (London, 1987) p. 145.

> furnishing schemes or domestic outlets. It is also possible for individuals to specialise in the craftsman-designer field.[949]

Course details for the session 1976-7 note that the aim of the degree course was to 'educate students to think clearly and objectively, to analyse problems and with relevant data to develop ideas to the needs of the consumer'.[950] The prospectus goes on to state that:

> The educational programme is directed towards the development of the essential personal qualities of creativity, sensitivity and responsibility. In the first year the courses are primarily concerned with the teaching of facts, skills and the mechanics of designing but as the course proceeds, projects become more complex and demanding as an increasing number of considerations have to be assessed and unified with the total concept.[951]

Birmingham's prospectus for 1976-7 states that:

> It is the excellence of performance that concerns us at the City of Birmingham Polytechnic, in ensuring that aspiring designers with their natural talent, together with the quality of their education, will best serve the needs of the profession and the community, yet exercise responsibility for the environment in which they practise and live.[952]

The RCA prospectus for 1975-76 gives details of the MA in Furniture Design and notes that the School of Furniture Design was 'concerned with the design of furniture, and related products, in the broadest sense', with the course designed to 'allow each student to develop his or her individual talent'.[953] According to the prospectus, a close link was maintained with industry, covering a range of industrial processes and technologies.[954]

6.10 Report on industrial design education

The Council for Art and Industry, authors of the 1937 *Design and the Designer in Industry* report, was a direct predecessor of the Council of Industrial Design which was

---

[949] *City of Leicester Polytechnic: Full time prospectus 1975-1976* p. 23.
[950] *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1976-77* p. 41.
[951] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[952] *City of Birmingham Polytechnic Handbook 1976-7* p. 35.
[953] *Royal College of Art Calendar 1975-76* p. 60.
[954] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

founded in 1944, and which was then renamed as the Design Council in 1972. In 1977 the Design Council published a report entitled *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom*, known as the Carter report, after the chair of the sub-committee, David Carter. The Design Council was concerned with 'the improvement of the design of products in British engineering industries', and the Carter report is the first report to look specifically at industrial design education.[955] The committee within the Design Council that carried out the report was set up to look more closely at design in industry; it was to be concerned with: 'those aspects of industrial design that relate closely to engineering design, but shall consider any other areas of industrial design which they feel will be of relevance to this study'.[956]

As the Carter report notes, by 1977 the term 'industrial design' had become quite broad and difficult to pin down:

> The committee is aware that 'industrial design' as practised today encompasses such a wide range of activities that it is difficult to produce a concise and unqualified definition of the term. Indeed, the term industrial design has sometimes been used to embrace the whole range of design skills taught in colleges of art and design and may include the design of textiles, graphics, furniture and interiors in addition to certain aspects of engineering product design.[957]

The report goes on to note that the term 'industrial design' had begun to be used more in relation to engineering products, and it is in that sense that the term is used in the report.[958] The prospectuses of the three art schools also reflect the change in terminology; Birmingham's prospectus for the 1964-5 session is the first time that the Dip A.D in Industrial Design (Engineering) is mentioned. Within Three Dimensional Design at Birmingham was a School of Furniture and a School of Industrial Design (Engineering), suggesting that furniture design was not seen as strictly 'industrial' design and perhaps still retained some of its craft elements rather than being completely about machined or engineered products.[959]

---

[955] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 5.
[956] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[957] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[958] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[959] *Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts 1964-5* pp. 56 & 63.

Leicester's prospectuses were rather more vague about industrial design courses; there was a School of Industrial Design as early as 1948, though the evidence from the 1950-51 prospectus suggests that the title of School of Industrial Design was more of an umbrella term for a rather disparate group of courses involving 'design and craftsmanship' and included courses in Cabinetmaking, Upholstery and French Polishing; Metalwork and Plastics; Sculpture, Lettercutting, Plasterwork and Pottery; Painting and Decorating; Commercial Art and Display; Design for Textiles; Weaving; Men's Tailoring.[960] In 1975 Leicester students could do a BA in Furniture Design or a BA in Industrial Design (Engineering), though the following year this had changed and students could take Industrial Design (Engineering) or Industrial Design (Furniture).[961] The prospectus for 1975 states that Industrial Design (Eng) is a subject 'concerned with manufactured goods ranging from capital equipment to domestic utensils and from computers to hospital equipment', while Furniture Design:

> may be concerned with large scale contract furnishing schemes or domestic outlets. It is also possible for individuals to specialise in the craftsman/designer field.[962]

In the 1976-7 prospectus, it was noted that:

> The studies (engineering and furniture) are grouped together in recognition of the fact that many of the problems encountered in designing for industry are common to both the Furniture Designer and the Industrial Designer in the more technologically based industries. It is frequently only the scale or technical complexity which differentiates between the two and by broadening the field, it is believed that the individual student is given freedom to develop without the constraints of traditional divisions.[963]

The Royal College of Art had a department of Engineering Design in 1955, though by the following year this came under the Faculty of Industrial Design and was called the Department of Industrial Design (Engineering).[964]

---

[960] City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1950-1951* p. 10.
[961] *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus 1975-1976* p. 23 & *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Courses 1976-77* p. 38.
[962] *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus 1975-1976* p. 23.
[963] *Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Courses 1976-77* p. 41.
[964] *Royal College of Art Calendar 1955-5* p. 69 & *Royal College of Art Calendar 1956-57* p. 69.

The Carter report describes an industrial designer as someone 'involved with the design of three-dimensional products, which may range from consumer goods (such as toothbrushes and saucepans) to technologically more sophisticated equipment (such as machine tools, typewriters and cameras)'.[965] Although furniture is not included in this description, and tended to be seen as a separate subject by art schools, at least initially, it is a three dimensional consumer good, and whilst not on the smaller scale of toothbrushes or saucepans, there would be some overlap in terms of the skills required in designing smaller goods or furniture, as the Leicester prospectus noted. The Carter report goes on to note about the industrial designer that: 'His interest is primarily in the relationship between the product and the user and his work embodies such considerations as ergonomics, safety and convenience, as well as visual and expressive values', which would seem to all apply equally to furniture as to other smaller products.[966]

In the 1970 *Employment of Art College* Leavers survey, employers were asked which attributes they looked for when considering employing art school graduates. Furniture manufacturers rated attributes in decreasing order of importance; basic design skills were considered the third most important attribute, and drawing ability was fourth. Technical knowledge was then rated fifth, and a knowledge of costs and economics was rated sixth.[967] Seven years later, the Carter report noted that industrialists felt that industrial designers should be competent in basic design, freehand and engineering drawing, aesthetics of colour and form, principles of marketing, and have a working knowledge of engineering technology.[968] Evidently there were certain skills and attributes which employers considered important for graduates to possess, and interestingly, the ability to draw was still considered important by industrialists and employers, even though fine art training was no longer considered a necessary part of art school courses. The drawing referred to by employers and industrialists was more technical or engineering drawing, as well as a certain amount of freehand drawing,

---

[965] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 11.
[966] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 11.
[967] Figures taken from table in J. Ritchie *et al* / Office of Population Census and Surveys Social Survey Division *The Employment of Art College Leavers* (London, 1972) p. 200-201.
[968] *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom* (London, 1977) p. 11.

perhaps to sketch out initial ideas for a product, and this type of drawing does seem to have been taught as part of industrial design courses even though the 'fine art' elements (life / figure drawing and still life) were dropped.

The Carter report agreed that industrial design degrees should provide a broad education, but recommended that there should be more awareness of the requirements of industry.[969] Those responsible for planning courses should emphasise the knowledge and skills 'peculiar to industrial design' rather than attempting to cover too wide a range of design activities.[970] The report also thought that the project system of students undertaking projects to design certain items was a successful method of education as long as it was supported by lectures and seminars. Care was required in the selection of projects so that they weren't a waste of the student's time.[971] The committee recommended that those responsible for planning courses should try and place students in industry for a period of their course. As the Carter report states: 'Industrial experience, whether it be in a design office, machine shop, tool room or assembly shop, is of great value to design students, and while the committee understands the problems that colleges have in locating adequate numbers of vocational study places, it feels that opportunities are frequently missed by course tutors who do not appreciate that comparatively humble work in a production plant can often be of greater value than that available in a small independent design office'.[972] This was an issue which recurred in debates about design education. As far back as 1937 recommendations were made that students should spend time in industry to gain knowledge of technical processes and production methods, and though art schools such as Leicester and Birmingham had given students the opportunity to spend time in industry, as *The Employment of Art College Leavers* survey had found that the opportunities for industrial experience as part of a course were somewhat patchy across art schools. As far as post-graduate courses were concerned, the Carter report thought that they were becoming more necessary for those wishing to become designers. As the report states:

---

969 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
970 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
971 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
972 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

> The committee believes that, as first degree courses are intended primarily to provide a broad education in design, they cannot at the same time be expected to prepare all students to a high level of professional competence. However, it accepts that some students will wish to terminate their education on completion of their first degree and that a number may indeed be able to make a valuable contribution to industry at that stage.[973]

For students wishing to go further though, the committee recommended that a further two years study at an educational institution or on a supervised industrial training scheme was essential to the proper development of a designer.[974] The view of the committee was that educational institutions should work together with industry to offer a range of specialised post-graduate training or research opportunities to students. These could be courses that could fulfil different functions: prepare students for professional practice; provide specialised study in an area of industrial design; provide a conversion course to industrial design for students from other disciplines (such as architecture or engineering); provide training for those from various backgrounds who wished to work in design education; and provide opportunities for design research.[975]

6.11 What did industry want?

Following the Carter report there were still suggestions that the skills possessed by graduates of art and design courses in the UK did not meet the requirements of British industry, and this could have implications in terms of the UK securing business.[976] In 1983 the Design Council published a report entitled *The Industrial Design Requirements of Industry*, which had been commissioned jointly by The Department of Education and Science and the Design Council in order to identify the skills, abilities and levels of knowledge required by industrial designers in specific manufacturing industries in the UK and Europe, and to assess how well industrial designers met the

---

[973] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[974] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[975] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[976] Chris Hayes Associates *The Industrial Design Requirements of Industry: A report commissioned by the Department of Education and Science in association with The Design Council and undertaken by Chris Hayes Associates and Keller Dorsey Associates* (London, 1983) p. 7.

needs of industry.[977] Whilst the report does not deal with the methods or organisation of design education, it does give a telling picture of the difference between what industrialists required and what design graduates could provide. Richard Stewart, in his 1987 book, writes that due recognition was now being given to engineering and technology, but instead of concern over there being too few designers for industry, as was the case in the past, 'the problem now to be faced was not one of supply, but of residual mismatch between education and industry', and it was this mismatch between education and industry which the *Industrial Design Requirements of Industry* set out to investigate.[978] The project was started in January 1980 and interviews were completed by the end of December 1981; around 300 individuals from 130 manufacturing and other companies in the UK, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Scandinavia were interviewed for the report.[979] Eighty-five UK manufacturers were interviewed, and 78 of these gave information about their employment of designers.[980] Seventy-one of the 78 companies utilised designers to a significant extent; 46 firms did most of their industrial design in-house, and 25 companies contracted it out.[981] Between them the companies employed a total of 168 industrial designers and 75% of these had a degree or other qualification.[982] Of the 46 companies which did most of their design work in-house, 32 of them had an industrial design unit. Decisions about the design of products tended to be made by consensus via a board or product development committee rather than individual designers.[983]

There was general agreement about the main tasks of industrial designers, which included the selection of a final design solution, undertaking detailed design, and selection of materials.[984] The two most important tasks that industrial designers had to perform however, were visualising the product and presenting alternative design

---

977 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
978 R. Stewart *Design and British Industry* (London, 1987) p. 231.
979 Chris Hayes Associates *The Industrial Design Requirements of Industry: A report commissioned by the Department of Education and Science in association with The Design Council and undertaken by Chris Hayes Associates and Keller Dorsey Associates* (London, 1983) p. 9.
980 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
981 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
982 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
983 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
984 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

solutions.[985] Employers felt that the presentation of alternative design solutions was particularly important as they could then satisfy themselves that all the major possibilities had been covered, and it would ensure that the design that was chosen was the most appropriate response to production, financial and market constraints.[986] It was also in presenting alternative design solutions that there was the biggest mismatch between what industrialists wanted and what they felt industrial designers could provide; the second largest mismatch was in creating a new product concept.[987] There were also felt to be issues regarding the ability to visualise the product concept, to design product ancillaries (such as packaging or display stands), and rectifying or 'debugging' designs.[988] The survey results indicated that the most important skills that an industrial designer was felt to need were creative / original thinking; selection of colours, textures and forms; being able to collaborate as part of a team; sketching; attention to detail; working to deadlines; selecting finishes for a product; being able to communicate orally, and presentation drawing.[989] Overall, the level of 'basic design competencies' that graduates possessed was seen as quite good – these competencies were classed as: skill at visualising an overall design concept from basic information; producing pictorial representations of that; original thought about a design / thinking laterally; a good aesthetic sense and 'flair'; a sound analytic approach to design methodology. Some areas of weakness centred around a knowledge and selection of materials for a product, including a knowledge of materials with specific properties such as heat resistance, an awareness of new materials (especially polymers), and the willingness to select the most cost effective material even if it is less 'attractive'.[990]

Those who responded to the survey thought that there would be little overall change in the basic design skills required for industry though there were several skills which employers anticipated becoming more important over the coming years; analysing product failure or success, developing a design brief, carrying out user research, evaluation of market opportunity, assisting with production engineering and developing

[985] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[986] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[987] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[988] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[989] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[990] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

a selling strategy.[991] There were also specific skills relating to the corporate environment that designers were felt to be lacking, namely, the adoption of a disciplined, professional approach - especially in respect of deadlines, non-visual communication skills, willingness to compromise, and the ability to collaborate effectively within a design team.[992] Interviewees felt that art and design education did not help the designer to understand the 'product design-production-sales process' or the industrial designer's role in that process. Neither did education emphasise the importance of design teams and the need to be able to work effectively within teams.[993] There were two final areas in which education was felt to be lacking; firstly was that of financial awareness. Those interviewed for the survey thought that education didn't explain the various ways in which design affects product costs, or emphasise the importance of cost-effective versus aesthetic design.[994] The second area was that of marketing awareness: employers felt that designers were not sufficiently aware of marketing realities, and did not pay enough attention to customer feedback, in particular that gradual changes in products were more likely to be accepted than a radical new design, and that often the reality is that a 'beautiful' product does not necessarily sell well.[995] Designers were felt to concentrate too much on what they thought customers ought to want, rather than what they actually wanted, so they tried to educate public taste rather than respond to it.[996]

In the light of changes in industry, Leicester Polytechnic had recognised a need to reassess their courses and in their *Annual Report* for 1983-4 the School of Industrial Design report noted that:

> The School has become increasingly aware of the necessity to examine its courses critically in response to the present climate of industrial change. This is not seen merely as an elaboration of present curriculae. It is accepted nationally that the role of the designer extends beyond that of innovator and that the activity of design is a continuing operation throughout all aspects of manufacture and commercial processes.[997]

---

[991] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[992] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[993] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[994] *Ibid.*, pp. 26-7.
[995] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[996] *Ibid.*, p. 27-8.
[997] *Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1983-84* p. 29.

The CNAA Quinquennial Review of Leicester Polytechnic for 1984 also noted curriculum changes taking place in the light of changing technology. The report for the School of Industrial Design stated that:

> First, the School is responding to the growth in new technology…..Secondly, there has been an increase in project work, particularly that related to actual industrial, commercial or community activities. The student's awareness of the professional work is heightened by the recent introduction of a structured management programme and continuing input from visiting lecturers.[998]

Also in 1983, a *Report to the Design Council on the Design of British Consumer Goods* was published, which noted that the production of domestic furniture had shown a steady decline.[999] Within the furniture industry there was also found to be a 'deep misunderstanding' between industrialists who expected graduates to be trained and ready to perform, and students who had been given a free rein and had received an education but not necessarily a training.[1000] By 1982, Leicester's School of Industrial Design was no longer offering the BA Industrial Design: students instead took the BA Three Dimensional Design in Interior Design, Industrial Design, Furniture, Silver or Ceramics.[1001] Details for the furniture option state that the course offers a challenging education for those wishing to pursue careers in Furniture design, achieved through 'a systematic accumulation of knowledge and the development of a range of attitudes and skills'.[1002] These included problem solving, communication of ideas, practical skills, management, and a professional approach to design.[1003] First year students were taught basic skills such as drawing, presentation and workshop practice through undertaking various projects, while the second and third years were an introduction to production and practice and the consolidation of knowledge through more realistic projects. There were opportunities to visit industry, and several of the part-time lecturers in the department were practising designers who would also bring their industrial experience to the students.[1004]

---

[998] *Leicester Polytechnic CNAA Quinquennial Review 1984* p. 36.
[999] R. Stewart *Design and British Industry* (London, 1987) p. 234.
[1000] *Ibid.,* p. 234.
[1001] *1982-83 full-time Courses at Leicester Polytechnic* p. 58.
[1002] *Ibid.,* p. 60.
[1003] *Ibid.,* p. 60.
[1004] *Ibid.,* p. 60.

Like Leicester, Birmingham's BA degree was in Three Dimensional Design with Furniture Design an option alongside five other subjects. The prospectus for 1988-9 does not give much information about the furniture design course, merely stating:

> A broadly based design education, supported by the acquisition of a range of professional, practical and technical skills, forms the basis of a series of experiences and opportunities to learn and explore new ideas in the design of furniture and its environment. The full spectrum of furniture is approached; industrially-produced, craft made and sculpturally-inspired, relating ideas to peoples needs, responses and to commercial potential.[1005]

The RCA's prospectus for 1982-3 states that students on the MA in Furniture Design are 'encouraged to re-assess their attitude to furniture design and to work out a personal approach, whether they wish to design for production by industry or individually made items'.[1006] The tutors of the department were all practising designers, and additional teaching was undertaken by visiting designers and specialists in various fields; in addition 'A close liaison is maintained with industry and this is backed by comprehensive workshop facilities for prototype making together with the skills and facilities available in other departments of the College'.[1007] The 1983-4 prospectus notes that the emphasis of the School is on 'furniture and related products designed for quantity production although the School also encourages individual craftsmen who wish to design and make their own furniture'.[1008] From 1977 until the end of the 1984-5 session, the RCA also offered a MA in Furniture Design linked with the Polymer Engineering course at Brunel University, which was concerned with the use of plastics in furniture design; the course was based at the RCA.[1009]

[1005] *City of Birmingham Polytechnic Handbook 1988-89* p. 19.
[1006] *Royal College of Art Yearbook 1982-83* p. 42.
[1007] *Ibid.*, p. 42.
[1008] *Royal College of Art Prospectus 1983-84* p. 39.
[1009] *Royal College of Art Yearbook 1977:1978* p. 49.

6.12 The relationship changes

The creation of polytechnics alongside universities in the late 1960s had created what was termed the binary policy.[1010] While universities tended to focus on more academic and scientific subjects, the emphasis of the polytechnics was more vocational and applied work. Some were critical of this binary policy, as Regan, writing in 1977, noted:

> The principal objection levelled at the binary system by its critics is that it divides higher education into superior and inferior leagues. The polytechnics have no chance of being accepted as equal to, though different from, the universities.[1011]

Tight writes that it was widely accepted that the polytechnics would aspire to become universities, though in actual fact the binary system proved quite robust, and lasted from 1966 until 1992.[1012] From 1966 until 1989 polytechnics remained under control of the local education authorities, with the CNAA as the national awarding body for degrees. In 1989 polytechnics were awarded corporate status, and three years later the Higher and Further Education Act was passed which made further provision for higher education in England and Wales and gave polytechnics and some larger colleges university status.[1013] In 1984 there were 48 universities in Britain; in 1992 following the Further and Higher Education Act there were 86. Both Leicester and Birmingham polytechnics became universities; Leicester became De Montfort University, and Birmingham became the University of Central England in Birmingham (now Birmingham City University). As Kogan and Hanney write, the awarding of university status to polytechnics actually gave them more freedom than they have previously enjoyed:

> In important respects, the former polytechnics became more free than they were before incorporation under the 1988 Act; the controls exercised by their local authorities were removed, as were those of the Council for National Academic Awards by the 1992 Act.[1014]

[1010] M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 70.
[1011] D. Regan *Local Government and Education* (London, 1977) p. 183-4 Cited in M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 71.
[1012] M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 81.
[1013] *Ibid.*, p. 70.
[1014] M. Kogan & S. Hanney *Reforming Higher Education* (London, 2000) p. 47 Cited in M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 71.

Between 1967 and 1992 some important changes affected art and design education, not least the transition from art schools to art and design departments or faculties within polytechnics. Scholars such as Pratt and Burgess have cited the formation of polytechnics as the cause of what has been termed 'academic drift' – the aspiration of the polytechnics to become universities, which led to the original aim of polytechnics as providers of professional and vocational courses being forgotten in the pursuit of more academic subjects and university status.[1015] This academic drift is generally seen as coming from within polytechnics; in the case of design education it can be argued that the academicisation of the subject came from without; it was imposed on art and design education by the Minister for Education, and by the NCDAD when the Dip A.D was introduced in 1962. Design education then began to split into two strands; polytechnics offered BA degree course for students training to be designers, while courses for technicians and skilled workers were phased out of polytechnics and became the remit of colleges of further education.

Changes in industrial processes and techniques in the 1960s and 1970s led to changes in art school curricula; design courses became increasingly industrially oriented and many of them changed their names to 'Industrial Design' as a reflection of this. Students were also encouraged to spend time in industry, and those that did found this helpful, though it seems provision for this was somewhat patchy across the country. The process of designing within industry itself also changed; rather than a designer working in the design room and sending designs out to the production floor to be produced by technicians and skilled workers, as had been the case in the 1930s, design had become much more collaborative, and by the 1970s students needed to be able to communicate well, work as part of a team and understand considerations of costs and marketing, in addition to their design skills.

This chapter has examined the changes in art and design education from 1968-1992 and has demonstrated that these came about primarily because of external events: the Minister for Education's wish to raise standards in art and design education with the

[1015] J. Pratt & T Burgess *Polytechnics: A report* (London: Pitman, 1974) p. 76 & 172 cited in Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* (Maidenhead, 2009) p. 104.

introduction the Dip A.D; the creation of polytechnics; the change from Dip A.Ds to BA degrees; the polytechnics achieving university status. These changes ended the direct oversight of government on art and design education, and also ended 130 years of drawing being considered a necessary part of art and design education. This chapter has also extended the scope of the history of the development of design education up to 1992 and has placed it within the wider context of changes in higher and further education. This has demonstrated that although government was now no longer in direct control of design education, changes were taking place both in industry and education more generally which kept the questions of what should be taught and how, alive.

Conclusion

Utilising a wide range of archival sources this thesis has provided a fresh narrative of art and design education for the period 1837-1992. It has extended the scope of existing narratives on art and design education and has also focussed solely on the development of design education, whilst taking into account its place within the wider context of art and design education. In addition this thesis has taken a *longue durée* approach to the history of the development of design education in order to show a pattern of recurring debates regarding design education; namely, who it is for and how it should be taught. This thesis argues that in order to understand the reason for the recurring debates the historical context within which design education has developed has to be considered alongside policy. When the School of Design was founded in 1837, it was something of an experiment; no attempt had been made at formalising design education previously, and there was no clear and consistent vision of what 'design' was or how it should be taught. Indeed, the early years of the School were described by the 1864 Select Committee as a period of experiment.[1016] As chapter two demonstrates, a re-examination of the 1835-6 Select Committee report and a revisiting of extant sources on the subject reveals that it was a multiplicity of issues which led to the founding of the School of Design: concerns over the perceived superiority of French designs; the perceived economic benefits of design; the desire to improve public taste through art; whether training artisans would be beneficial to manufactures; the perceived moral benefits of art. Many of these issues then contributed to the initial confusion about what the School of Design was for and what it should be teaching its students.

The remit of the Select Committee of 1835-6 was to 'inquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the Arts and of the Principles of Design among the People (especially the Manufacturing Population) of the Country', and this statement hints at some of the issues which were later to come to the fore.[1017] A School of Design teaching art to the general population would be different from a School of Design

[1016] Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, (1864) HC 466, iii.
[1017] *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index,* (1836) HC 568, ii

teaching art to artisans and the manufacturing population. The first would be to improve the taste of the public, and perhaps educate them in art for their own enjoyment and improvement, but not necessarily for any end; the second, however, would be in order that they might take what they learnt at the School of Design into their work and produce better designed goods which could compete with French goods. The School of Design aimed, at first, to do both, but it was soon realised that as far as artisans were concerned, they were attending the School of Design without having had any prior education in drawing and needed to be taught 'from scratch' rather than do any of the advanced work which had been the aim of the School of Design. As chapter three shows, the solution to the problem was the introduction of a standardised drawing-based curriculum which was followed by all students at every art school in the country. Cole introduced this system, and while it offered people the chance to learn to draw when it might previously have been unavailable to them, it also steered the development of art and design education away from utility to manufactures for almost 50 years. This was the first time that a system of education had been undertaken on such a large scale, and in that sense, Cole is to be applauded. Where he might be regarded more negatively, however, is that in rolling out a system of mass education in drawing which was standardised and formal, Cole steered design education on a tangent away from relevance to industry and manufacturing from which it took art and design education a long time to recover.

During the early 1900s some art schools introduced craft classes and more practical work in an attempt to give their students training which more relevant to the jobs they were doing, but it was not until the 1930s that questions regarding the training of designers for industry came to the fore again, and by this time the context in which those debates would take place had changed. As chapter four shows, the questions facing policy-makers now related to increasing mechanisation within industry, and whether design education should remain craft-based or take into account modern production methods and machinery in training students to work in industry. There were also questions regarding the Royal College of Art which was still primarily a teacher-training institution; should it remain so, and if not, what was its place within the system

of art and design education? These questions were prevented from being resolved with the outbreak of the Second World War.

Towards the end of the Second World War and into the immediate post-war period it became evident that mechanisation and mass production were rendering craft techniques largely obsolete in many industries and it was evident that designers who could design with mechanisation in mind were required. As chapter five demonstrates, within the context of these changes in industry design education was faced with questions of how to make training for designers more relevant to industry. For the first time since the early 1900s, art and design education was overhauled and the National Diploma in Design (NDD) introduced in 1946. This was an attempt to return design education to a more practical outlook than it previously had, by offering more in depth training at a vocational level and giving students the chance to do more practical work and gain knowledge of processes and technologies used in industry. Following the Diploma, there was the opportunity of advanced and specialised study at the RCA, which had by now been reorganised. Teacher training had been ended at the College, and it had been brought back to its original aim of training designers.

It can be suggested that the NDD was perhaps the most relevant solution to the question of how to train designers for industry. It was an attempt to re-orient design education towards industry, and it also enabled art schools to construct their own courses for the NDD, which enabled them to be tailored to the needs of local industries if required, and the training was to be more practical and vocational than had previously been the case. Whilst this was a positive move, it resulted in a large number of highly specialised courses, such as die-sinking and lithography and was seen as too specific. The NDD was also regarded by many industrialists as primarily a teaching qualification, with furniture manufacturers unaware of it as a qualification with relevance to manufacturing.[1018]

[1018] *The Training of Designers for Industry: Furniture, Pottery, Printing and Textiles* Report of a One-Day Conference Between Industrialists and Educationalists (London, 1957) p. 7.

As chapter five also shows, changes were taking place in higher education more widely; there had been a post-war expansion in higher education, and the 1963 Robbins report advocated higher education courses should be available to anyone who was qualified to pursue them and who wished to do so.[1019] The Minister for Education wished to raise the standard of art and design education in line with university degrees and recommended that the NDD be replaced with a new Diploma which would approximate a university degree in length and standard. Rather than attempt to address concerns about the NDD and keep it as a more practical qualification which, with hindsight, it could be argued would be more relevant to industry, the Diploma in Art and Design was brought in which allowed art schools the freedom to decide whether to focus on fine craftsmanship with their courses, or concentrate their efforts on more industrially relevant courses. While the NDD had awarded art schools the freedom to construct their own courses, this was done with a vocational emphasis underpinning the qualification. Now, the Dip A.D allowed art schools to steer away from vocational courses and concentrate on fine art and craftsmanship if they desired. There was, though, still a mismatch in terms of the skills that students were felt to require to work in industry, and what they were being taught in art schools, and the 1970 survey *The Employment of Art College Leavers* was the first to document both the views of ex-art school students and employers on this subject. As chapter five also shows, the introduction of a compulsory 'academic' element into art and design education (study of the history of art and complementary studies) can be seen as the start of the academicisation of design education. Rather than coming from within the subject, in the case of design education it can be suggested that academicisation was placed upon it with the Minister for Education's desire to raise standards.

As chapter six demonstrates, design education underwent further changes between 1967 and 1992, partly due to the expansion of higher education, and partly due to changes within industry which impacted on courses. Birmingham and Leicester art schools became departments of polytechnics in 1969, and whilst they retained the freedom to construct and examine their own courses, they were now part of larger institutions and

[1019] Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* (1963) HC 2154, p 5.

had to contend with the various new procedures and processes that entailed. The introduction of polytechnics allowed art and design to come into contact with allied fields such as engineering and computing, and elements from those courses began to be included into art and design courses. As polytechnics already offered degree courses in professional and vocational courses, by the mid 1970s the Dip A.D was ended and BA degrees were also offered in art and design. In the years following the introduction of BA degrees, design courses did not change substantially; certainly not as much as they had done in the previous thirty years. Developments in technology and processes within the furniture industry meant that design courses became more 'industrial', and the names of degrees changed from Furniture Design to Industrial Design in reflection of this. Courses for apprentices were phased out of art schools in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and design education was provided for by two different types of institution; vocational courses for skilled workers and technicians became the remit of colleges of further education, and degrees for those training as designers were provided in polytechnics.

As has been demonstrated in this thesis, it is only when the historical context is taken into account that the repetitive nature of debates on design education begin to be explained. Further debates continued post-1992 with a renewed emphasis on the importance of design to the economy and the increasing interest in the 'creative industries', as jobs in the arts, media and design came to be called. Due to the volume of reports on the creative industries and design education produced since 2000 it was not possible to include post 1992 developments in design education here; a study of the period from 1992 onwards would constitute a thesis in itself and would be the natural continuation of the history of design education as outlined in this thesis.[1020] Alongside the desire to improve design education to meet the needs brought about by the growth of

[1020] For example Creative and Cultural Skills and the Design Council *Design a New Design Industry: Design Skills Consultation* 2006; Tanaka Business School at Imperial College London's *Making the Most of Design Excellence: Equipping UK designers to succeed in the global economy* 2007*;* The Department of Culture, Media and Sport *Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy* 2008; Design Council and Creative and Cultural Skills *High Level Skills for High Level Value: Design Blueprint* 2008; Derksen, U *Creative Challenge Research Report* University for the Creative Arts, 2010; Ball, L *et al Creative Graduates Creative Futures* Creative Graduates Creative Futures Higher Education partnership & Institute for Employment Studies, 2010; Design Commission *Restarting Britain: Design Education and Growth* 2011.

the creative industries are the wider changes in higher education that have occurred since 1992: the desire of the 1997 Labour Government to have half of all 18-30 year olds in some form of higher education or training; the expansion of the provision of university places; the introduction of student tuition fees which have led to universities increasingly viewing students as customers or consumers; the pressure to provide ‘value for money’ courses which ensure that students have the best chance of securing jobs after graduating. As the context within which art and design education operates is one that is constantly changing, debates on the subject have also been, and appear likely to remain, a constant.

Appendix 1

Institutional changes of name

Birmingham

1843 – Birmingham School of Design

1925 – Central School of Arts and Crafts

1935 – Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham

1937 – City of Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts

1964 – Birmingham College of Art

1970 – City of Birmingham Polytechnic

1992 - University of Central England in Birmingham

2007 – Birmingham City University

Leicester

1927 – City of Leicester College of Arts and Crafts

1928 – Leicester College of Arts and Crafts

1929 – Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology

1969 – City of Leicester Polytechnic

1975 – Leicester Polytechnic

1992 – De Montfort University

London

1837 – Government (Normal) School of Design

1853 – National Art Training School

1896 – Royal College of Art

Appendix 2

Chronological List of Academies of Art in Europe

Unless otherwise specified, the dates represent the founding of each academy. Modern-day names for countries are given.

Florence	Italy	1563
Rome	Italy	1593
Paris	France	1648
Bologna	Italy	1710
St Petersburg	Russia	1724 (reorganised 1757)
Stockholm	Sweden	1735 (reorganised 1768)
Ferrara	Italy	1737
Copenhagen	Denmark	1738 (reorganised 1754)
Montpelier	France	1738 (came under governmental control 1771)*
Rouen	France	1741
Gand	Belgium	1748
Lucca	Italy	1748
Reims	France	1748 (governmental control 1752)
Antwerp	Belgium	1750 (reorganised)
Beauvais	France	1750
Toulouse	France	1750
Geneva	Switzerland	1751
Genoa	Italy	1751
Madrid	Spain	1752
Mannheim	Germany	1752+
Mantua	Italy	1752
Marseille	France	1752
Glasgow	Scotland	1753 (private academy)
Valencia	Spain	1753
Lille	France	1755
Naples	Italy	1755
Bayreuth	Germany	1756
Tournai	Belgium	1756
Venice	Italy	1756
Le Mans	France	1757
Lyon	France	1757
Mainz	Germany	1757
Nantes	France	1757
Parma	Italy	1757
Amiens	France	1758
Amsterdam	Netherlands	1758 (reorganised)
Courtrai	Belgium	1760
Edinburgh	Scotland	1760
Tours	France	1760
Malines	Belgium	1761
Dresden	Germany	1762 (reorganised)

Grenoble	France		1762
Stuttgart	Germany		1762
Brussels	Belgium		1763 (reorganised)
Oudenaarde	Belgium		1763
Verona	Italy		1763
Leipzig	Germany		1764
Aix	France		1765
Dijon	France		1767
Dusseldorf	Germany		1767
St Omer	France		1767
London	England		1768
Carrara	Italy		1769
Arras	France		1770
Douai	France		1770
Munich	Germany		1770
Vienna	Austria		1770 (reorganised)
Öhringen	Germany		1771
Poitiers	France		1771
Hanau	Germany		1772
Ath	Belgium		1773
Besançon	France		1773
Liège	Belgium		1773
Rotterdam	Netherlands		1773
Troyes	France		1773
Zurich	Switzerland		1773
Zweibrücken	Germany		1773
Weimar	Germany		1774
Barcelona	Spain		1775
Milan	Italy		1776
Cassel	Germany		1777
The Hague	Netherlands		1778 (reorganised)
Middelburg	Netherlands		1778
Saragossa	Spain		1778
Turin	Italy		1778 (reorganised)
Ypres	Belgium		1778
Augsburg	Germany		1779 (reorganised)
Bayonne	France		1779
Frankfurt	Germany		1779
Valladolid	Spain		1779
Halle	Germany	circa	1780
Mons	Belgium		1781
Châtelleraut	France		1782
Langres	France		1782
Maçon	France		1783
St Quentin	France		1783
Valenciennes	France		1783
Berlin	Germany		1786
Karlsruhe	Germany		1786

Modena	Italy		1786 (reorganised)
Orléans	France		1786
Toulon	France		1786
Gotha	Germany	before	1787
Cadiz	Spain		1789

As Pevsner states, this list may well be incomplete as it shows only those academies which it is possible to trace.[1021] Those with 'reorganised' next to their date are those for which there is no precise founding date, but would obviously have been in existence in order to have been reorganised or remodelled on the date given.

* French art schools which had been started privately or as a municipal enterprise were eventually incorporated by the central government and continued as provincial schools.
+ Many of the Germany academies of art were drawing schools founded by the German princes in their capitals.

Taken from Pevsner, N *Academies of Art Past and Present* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940, chapter IV, pp140-143.

[1021] Pevsner, N *Academies of Art Past and Present* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940. p. 141.

Appendix 3

Branch Schools of Art

1837 The Normal or Government School of Design, London

1838 Manchester

1841 Spitalfields, London

1842 Female School (London), York

1843 Nottingham, Sheffield, Coventry, Birmingham, Newcastle upon Tyne

1844 Glasgow

1845 Norwich

1846 Stoke, Paisley, Leeds

1847 Hanley

1849 Belfast, Cork, Dublin

1850 Macclesfield

1851 Stourbridge, Worcester

1852 Limerick, Waterford

1853 Aberdeen, Bristol, Caernarvon, Cheltenham, Chester, Dudley, Durham, Newcastle Under Lyme, Penzance, St Thomas's Charterhouse Branch (London), Swansea, Truro, Warrington

1854 Andover, Bath, Carlisle, Exeter, Lambeth (London), Tavistock, Wolverhampton, St Martin's, (London)

1855 Birkenhead park, Birkenhead, Liverpool (South and North districts), Southampton (Hartley Institute), Shrewsbury,

1856 Coalbrookdale, Dundee (High School), Lancaster, Taunton

1857 Darlington, Stirling, Great Yarmouth

1858 Cambridge, Edinburgh (male and female schools), Ipswich, Devonport (Mechanics' Institute)

1859 Brighton, Gloucester, Halifax

1860 Boston, Bromsgrove, Cirencester, Preston, Reading, Stroud, Bridgewater

1869 Leicester

Appendix 4

National Course of Instruction for Schools of Art[1022]

The drawing course

Ornament stages

Stage 1 Linear drawing with instruments
A – linear geometry
B – mechanical drawings of architectural details
C – linear perspective
copies: plates mounted on card of geometry, architectural detail and perspective from the Department of Science and Art

Stage 2 Freehand outline of rigid forms from the flat copy
A –from a copy of an object
B – from a copy of an ornament
copies: for a) Brown's eight plates of freehand drawing; for b) copy of Tarsia Scroll supplied by the Dept. of Science and Art; or the Trajan Scroll from L Gruner *Specimens of ornamental art*; or the Trajan Frieze from Albertolli.

Stage 3 Freehand outline from the round (specimens or casts)
A – from models and objects
B – from a cast of ornament
Cast: either lower portion of the pilaster of the gates from La Madeleine, or a portion of the two pilasters from the tomb of Louis XII

Stage 4 Shading from the flat, examples of copies (usually in chalk)
A – from copies of models and objects
B – from a copy of ornament
Copies: for ornament, either Renaissance Rosette, or copy of an ancient cast or biga from L Gruner *Specimens of Ornamental Art*

Stage 5 Shading from the round, solids or casts (usually in chalk)
A – from solid models and objects
B – from cast of ornament
C – time sketching and sketching from memory
Cast: either the egg plant of the architrave of the Gates of Gilberti, or the lower portion of the Florentine Scroll

Stage 6 Human or animal figure from the flat
A – in outline
B – shaded

[1022] From de Beaumont, Lys *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869 – 1939* Leicester Polytechnic: unpublished MPhil thesis, 1987. Appendix 1 page i-iii.

Copies; outline of ‘Laocoon”; of Farnese ‘Hercules’ or outlines of the figure by Mr Herman, 22 plates.

Stage 7 Flowers, foliage and objects of natural beauty from the flat
A – in outline
B – shaded
Copies: Dicksee’s *Foliage, Fruit and Flowers;* or Albertolli’s *Foliage*

Stage 8 Human or animal figure from the round or from nature
A – outline from cast
B – shaded from cast
C – from the nude model
D – draped
E – time sketching from memory
Casts: a) – the Panthenaic frieze from the Parthenon; or b) the ‘Discobolus’ of Myron, or the ‘Discobolus’ of Naucydes, or the ‘Fighting Gladiator’

Stage 9 Anatomical studies
A – of the human figure from the flat
B – of animals from the flat
C – of either modelled
Examples: bones and muscles filled within the outline of the ‘Discobolus’ of Myron, or man and horse from the Panthenaic frieze.

Stage 10 Flowers, foliage, landscape details and objects of natural beauty from nature
A – in outline
B – shaded

The painting course

Stage 11 Painting ornament from the flat
A – in monochrome
B – in colour (water-colour, tempera, or oil)
Copies: the Trajan Scroll for a), and JC Robinson’s *collection of coloured ornaments* plates 3 or 9.

Stage 12 Painting ornament from the cast
Cast: roman rosette from the Capitol, or pomegranate and egg plant portion of the architrave of the Ghiberti Gates; or the Trajan Scroll.

Stage 13 Painting flowers, objects of natural beauty or landscapes from the flat
Copies for flowers: Torrenia Asiatica, or Pelargonium; for copies in tempera; Brooks *Study of Flowers*

Stage 14 Painting the above from nature
Painting stage 13 from nature

Stage 15 Painting sketches of an object or a group as a colour composition

Stage 16 Painting the human figure or animals in monochrome from the cast
Cast: female torso from the British Museum, or dancing girl with wreath (high relief in panel)

Stage 17 Painting the human figure
A – from the flat copy
B – from nature, nude or draped
C – time sketches and composition

The Modelling course

Stage 18 Modelling ornament
A – from the cast
B – from drawings
C - time sketches from example and memory
Cast: the nest of the scroll of the pilaster from the Villa Medici

Stage 19 Modelling the human figure or animals
A –from the cast or models of animals
B- from drawings
C – from the nude or draped
Cast: 'Hercules' or the 'Discobolus' of Myron or of Naucydes

Stage 20 Modelling flowers, fruit or foliage or objects of natural history from nature

Stage 21 Time sketches in clay of the human figure or animals from nature

The Design Course

Stage 22 Elementary design
A – natural objects ornamentally treated, usually botanical
B – ornamental arrangement to fill a given space in monochrome
C – in colour (shape and plant being decided by the department of science and art)
D – studies of historic ornament drawn or modelled

Special technical stage
special classes at south Kensington.

Bibliography

Primary Sources: listed by location

Birmingham City University

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1937-8 (School of Cabinet Making separate leaflet)

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1938-39

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1937-1938

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1938-1939

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1939-1940

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1951-1952

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1952-1953

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1953-1954

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1954-1955

Birmingham College of Art and Crafts Prospectus 1955-1956

Birmingham College of Art and Crafts School of Furniture and Allied Crafts 1955-1956 (separate leaflet).

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1958-1959

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1959-1960

Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus 1964-65.

Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, Prospectus 1930-1931

Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, Prospectus 1933-1934

Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham, Prospectus 1933-4 - Classes for Cabinet Makers (separate leaflet)

Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, Prospectus 1934-1935

Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham, Prospectus 1934-5 - School of Cabinet Making (separate leaflet)

Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, Prospectus 1935-1936

Central School of Arts and Crafts Birmingham, Prospectus 1936-1937

Central School of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham, School of Cabinet Making (separate leaflet) *1936-37*

City of Birmingham Polytechnic prospectus 1969-1970

City of Birmingham Polytechnic Handbook 1988-89

College of Arts and Crafts, Birmingham Prospectus 1951-1952

The British library

Ministry of Education / National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the length of the Diploma Course* London: HMSO, 1957.

Ministry of Education *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* London: HMSO, 1960

Vocational Courses in Art and Design: report of the working group on vocational courses in the design technician area London: HMSO, 1974

Federation of British Industries *Report of a one day conference between industrialists and educationalists on the training of designers for industry: furniture pottery and printing.* London, 1957

De Montfort University

City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1948-1949 (Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design* separate brochure)

City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1949-1950*

City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1951-1952*

City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1951-1952 (Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design* separate brochure)

City of Leicester Education Committee *Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1952-1953 (Leicester College of Art Department of Industrial Design* separate brochure)

City of Leicester Education Committee *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology 1963-4 (Leicester College of Art Faculty of Three Dimensional Design* separate brochure)

City of Leicester Education Committee *Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology 1950-1951*

City of Leicester Polytechnic Prospectus of full-time courses 1969-70

City of Leicester Polytechnic Prospectus of full-time courses 1970-71

City of Leicester Polytechnic Prospectus of full-time courses 1971-72

City of Leicester Polytechnic Prospectus of full-time courses 1972-73

City of Leicester Polytechnic General Information 1974-5

City of Leicester Polytechnic Full time prospectus 1975-1976

City of Leicester *Report on the work of the Education Committee 1972.*

College of Art Leicester Prospectus for Full-time Courses 1965-6

Council for Art and Industry *Design and the Designer in Industry*
London: HMSO 1937.

De Montfort University Undergraduate Programmes 1997

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 1999

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2000

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2001

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2002

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2003

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2004

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus '06

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2007

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2009

De Montfort University Undergraduate Prospectus 2010

Leicester College of Art War Work 1939-45

Leicester College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus for the session commencing 19 Sept 1927

Leicester College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus for the session commencing 18 Sept 1928

Leicester College of Arts and Crafts Prospectus for the session commencing 16 Sept 1929

Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design 1955-56 (separate prospectus)

Leicester College of Art and Design General Prospectus for full-time courses 1968-9

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Leicester: City of Leicester Education Committee, 1938.

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus for the session commencing 15 Sept 1930

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus for the session commencing 19 Sept 1932

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus for the session commencing 21 Sept 1931

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus session 1936-1937

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus session 1937-1938

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus session 1938-1939

Leicester College of Art and Technology Prospectus 1933-4

Leicester College of Art and Technology Prospectus 1934-5

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1935-1936

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1939-40

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus 1964-65

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology 1958-9

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology Prospectus: Session 1947-48 (Leicester College of Art

Prospectus 1947-48 School of Industrial Design separate brochure)

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology session 1961-62 (Leicester College of Art School of Industrial Design separate brochure)

Leicester Colleges of Art and Technology session 1962-63

Leicester College of Art and Design Prospectus 1968-9 Faculty of Industrial Design

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1977-78

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1978-7

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1979-80

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1980-81

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1981-82

Leicester Polytechnic Annual Report 1982-83

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1976-7

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1977-8

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1978-79

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1979-80

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time courses 1980-1

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1983-1984

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1984-1985

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1985-1986

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1986-1987

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1987-1988

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1988-1989

Leicester Polytechnic Full-time Prospectus and Guide to Applicants 1989-1990

Leicester Polytechnic *Full-time Prospectus 1991/92*

Leicester Polytechnic *Full-time Prospectus 1992/93*

Leicester Polytechnic: Council for National Academic Awards Quinquennial Review March 22/23, 1979.

1981-2 Full-time courses at Leicester Polytechnic

1982-3 Full-time courses at Leicester Polytechnic

Prospectus 1926-1927 City of Leicester College of Arts and Crafts

Gov.uk (website)

A. Carter-Silk & M. Lewiston *The Development of Design Law Past and Future: From History to Policy* Newport: Intellectual Property Office & Design Council, 2012 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-development-of-design-law-past-and-future - accessed 15/3/15

House of Commons Parliamentary Papers (website)

Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1845-6 London: HMSO, 1846

Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, House of Commons (598), 1835

Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, House of Commons (568), 1836.

Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index, (576) 1849,

Report of a Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design, appointed on the 3rd of November, 1846, To Consider and Report upon the State and Management of the School; with an Appendix London: HMSO, 1847

Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art: together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, (466) 1864,

Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the year 1843-4 London: HMSO, 1844.

The National Archives

Files

BT 60/94/14 Reports of the Furniture working Party (dated 7/11/46)

BT 64/1843 Furniture working party – design sub group – general correspondence arising out of the work of the group

BT 64/1844 Furniture working party – standards sub group: general correspondence arising out of the work of the group

ED 46/897 Report of the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations 1957-1958

ED 165/100 Royal College of Art 1958-1959

ED167/6 High Wycombe School of Art 1945-1955

ED 167/7 High Wycombe School of Art 1956-1964

ED167/265 Birmingham College of Art and Crafts 1945-1955

ED167/266 Birmingham College of Art and Crafts 1956-1964

ED167/267 Birmingham College of Art and Crafts 1965-1967

ED 167/382 Leicester College of Art and Crafts 1945-1955

ED 167/383 Leicester College of Art and Crafts 1956-1964

ED 167/384 Leicester College of Art and Crafts 1965-1967

ED 212/83 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design Quinquennial Review for 1967 (undated)

Individual documents

BT 64/1844 Council of Industrial Design *Design Centres - a Co-Operative Scheme for the Development of Industrial Design Centres* London; Council of Industrial Design, undated.

DB 4/55 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design, *First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* 1964

ED 46/154 Dickey, EMO'R *Design for Machine Production* 26 April 44

ED 46/154 Dutton, Norbert *Plan for a School of Technological Design: The Need for a New Educational Policy in the Training of Designers for Industry: and a Proposal for its Realisation* (undated)

ED 46/154 Post War Export Trade Committee Paper number 1 *Sub-Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry* 23 April 1942

ED 46/154 Post War Export Trade Committee Paper number 2 *Sub-Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry: The Place of Design in Post-War Planning for Industry* (undated)

ED 46/154 Post War Export Trade Committee Paper number 34 *Report of the Sub-Committee on Industrial Design and Art in Industry (draft)* dated 19 Nov 1942

ED 46/154 *Report to the Presidents of the Boards of Education and Trade* 27 Jan 1943

ED 46/154 Society of Industrial Artists *The Training of Designers for Industry: Proposals for Improving the Education and Status of the Artist-Designer* London April 1944

ED 46/897 *Report of the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations* London: HMSO, 1952

ED 54/467 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design Memorandum number 1*Memorandum on Courses Leading to the Award of Diploma in Art and Design* (New edition, March 1972)

ED 142/12 Ministry of Education *Circulars and Administrative Memoranda: issued during the period 1 April 1958 – 31 March 1959* London: HMSO, 1959

ED 167/266 Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts *Application for Approval of a Course leading to the Diploma in Art and Design*

ED 167/266 Birmingham College of Arts and Crafts *Lecture in the Principles of Teaching and School Management Session* 1945-6

ED 167/266 City of Birmingham Education Committee *Draft Instrument of Government for the College of Arts and Crafts*

ED 167/266 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *Application to the Council for Approval of a course leading to the Diploma in Art and Design*

ED/167/267 Letter from the NCDAD to the Chief Education Officer, City of Birmingham Education Committee (15 Feb 1965)

ED/167/267 Letter from the Department of Education and Science to the Birmingham Education Authority (6 July 1965)

ED 167/384 Ministry of Education *Further Education Grant Regulations Application for Recognition of a Course Educational Year 1957-1958.*

ED 176/382 Ministry of Education *Application for Recognition of a new establishment or a new Full-time or part-time day course in an existing establishment*

ED 212/83 National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design *Quinquennial Review for 1967* (2nd draft)

The Royal College of Art

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1926-1927*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1928-1929*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1929-1930*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1930-1931*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1931-1932*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1933-1934*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1934-1935*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1936-1937*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1937-1938*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1938-1939*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1939-1940*

Board of Education *Prospectus of the Royal College of Art 1941-1942*

Prospectus Royal College of Art Session 1946-7

Prospectus Royal College of Art Session 1948-9

Prospectus Royal College of Art 1987-88

Prospectus Royal College of Art 90/91

Prospectus 2008/09 Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design

Prospectus 2009/2010 Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1957-58

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1958-59

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1959-60

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1960-61

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1961-62

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1962-63

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1963-64

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1964-65

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1965-66

RCA Calendar: Royal College of Art 1966-67

Royal College of Art Annual Review and Prospectus 2000-01

Royal College of Art Calendar and Prospectus 1949-50

Royal College of Art Calendar 1951-52

Royal College of Art Calendar 1952-53

Royal College of Art Calendar 1953-1954

Royal College of Art Calendar 1954-1955

Royal College of Art Calendar 1955-1956

Royal College of Art Calendar 1956-1957

Royal College of Art Calendar 1967-68

Royal College of Art Calendar 1968-1969

Royal College of Art Calendar 1969-1970

Royal College of Art Calendar 1970-71

Royal College of Art Calendar 1971-72

Royal College of Art Calendar 1972-73

Royal College of Art Calendar 1973-74

Royal College of Art Calendar 1974-75

Royal College of Art Calendar 1975-76

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 1997/98

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 1999/2000

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 2001/2002

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 2002/2003

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 2003/2004

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 2004/2005

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 2005/2006

Royal College of Art Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus 07/08

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1950-51

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1984-1985

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1985-1986

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1986/87

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1992-1993

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1993-94

Royal College of Art London Prospectus 1994-95

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1995-96

Royal College of Art Prospectus 1996/97

Royal College of Art Prospectus 88/89

Royal College of Art Prospectus 89/90

Royal College of Art Prospectus 91/92

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1976:1977

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1977:1978

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1979:1980

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1980-82

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1982-83

Royal College of Art Yearbook 1983-84

Royal College of Art 2006/7 Postgraduate Art and Design Prospectus

University of Birmingham

Board of Trade *Working Party Reports: Furniture* London: HMSO, 1946.

Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63* London: HMSO, 1963.

Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Appendix three to the report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63: Teachers in higher education* London, HMSO, 1963.
Cmnd. 2154-III

Committee on Higher Education *Higher Education: Appendix two (B) to the report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63: Students and Their Education* London, HMSO, 1963.
Cmnd. 2154-II-I

Council for Art and Industry *Education for the Consumer: art in elementary and secondary school education* London: HMSO, 1935

Council for Art and Industry *The Working Class Home: its furnishing and equipment* London: HMSO, 1937

Department of Education and Science / National Advisory Council on Art Education *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector: Report of a Joint Committee of the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design* London: HMSO, 1970

Design Council *Industrial Design Education in the United Kingdom: a report to the Design Council's Design Education Study Group by its Industrial Design Education Sub-Committee* London: Design Council, 1977

Ministry of Education *Art Education* (pamphlet no. 6) London: HMSO, 1946

Ministry of Education *Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools of Art: Second report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education* London: HMSO, 1962

Sparkes, JCL *Schools of Art: their Origin, History, Work, and Influence* London: printed and published for the Executive Council of the International Health Exhibition and for the Council of the Society of Arts by William Clowes and Sons, Limited, 1884

Sizer, P *Structure of the British Domestic Furniture Industry* University of Aston Management Centre Working Paper series no. 31, November 1974

V&A Archive of Art and Design

AAD/1994/16/1502 Design Council *The Industrial Design Requirements of Industry* 1983

AAD/1994/16/1503 *Report to the Design Council on the Design of British Consumer Goods* The Design Council, 1983

AAD/1994/16/1506 *Utility Furniture*

Heal and Son Holdings plc., bedding and furniture manufacturer and retailer, records, 1810 - 2001

AAD/1978/2/518 'Artist in Wood' *Furnishing* September 1948

AAD/1994/16/276 British Tego Gluefilm *This is 'Tego' Gluefilm* London, 1939

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from De La Rue Plastics Limited to Anthony Heal, 7 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from Anthony Heal to HP Bridge, De La Rue Plastics Limited, 8 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from Anthony Heal to Hordern Richmond Aircraft Ltd, 3 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from AAD Lang, Hordern Richmond Aircraft Ltd, 4 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from Anthony Heal to Hordern Richmond Aircraft Ltd, 5 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from AAD Lang, Hordern Richmond Aircraft Ltd, 16 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from Anthony Heal to Major Mohr, Micanite and Insulators Company Ltd, 3 June 1943

AAD/1994/16/276 Letter from the Managing Director, Micanite and Insulators Company Ltd, to Anthony Heal, 9 June 1943

Secondary sources

Theses (location included)

E. Bird *The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century*
Loughborough University of Technology: Unpublished PhD thesis, 1992.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?did=3&uin=uk.bl.ethos.314480

H. Cunliffe-Charlesworth *The Royal College of Art: Its Influence on Education, Art and Design 1900-1950*
Sheffield City Polytechnic: unpublished PhD thesis, 1991.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?did=1&uin=uk.bl.ethos.306221

PJ. Cunningham *The formation of the Schools of Design 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds* University of Leeds: Unpublished thesis, 1979.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?did=5&uin=uk.bl.ethos.503013

L. de Beaumont *The History of Leicester School of Art 1869-1939*
Leicester Polytechnic: Unpublished MPhil thesis, 1987
De Montfort University archives

CD. Edwards *Stimulus and Response: An investigation into changes in the furniture industry between 1880-1920*
Royal College of Art: Unpublished MA thesis, 1988.
Wycombe Museum, Buckinghamshire

CD. Edwards *New materials and techniques and their impact on furniture manufacture in the nineteenth century*
Royal College of Art, London: unpublished PhD, 1991.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?did=3&uin=uk.bl.ethos.283678

PA. Kirkham *Furniture Making in London, c.1700-1870: Craft, Design, Business and Labour*
Queen Mary, University of London: Unpublished PhD, 1982. British Library ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?did=32&uin=uk.bl.ethos.318213

W. Lancaster *Radicalism to Socialism: The Leicester Working Class 1860-1906*
University of Warwick: unpublished PhD, 1982
Warwick University (online http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/4394/)

M. Romans *Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain*
The Birmingham Institute of Art and Design, University of Central England: unpublished PhD thesis, 1998.
Birmingham City University, School of Art library

J. Rutland *The History of Art and Furniture Design Education in High Wycombe – 1870-1970*
Unpublished MPhil thesis, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College / Brunel University, 2001.
Buckinghamshire Chilterns New University

JA. Webb *An Analysis of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures of 1835-6; Anatomy, Benthamism and Design* University of Wolverhampton: unpublished PhD thesis, 2003.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.408479

KA. Wilson *High Wycombe's Furniture Industry 1900-1950*
Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, 2003.
British Library Ethos
http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.422107

Monographs

RD. Altick *Victorian People and Ideas*

London; JM Dent and Sons, 1974.

C. Ashwin *Art Education: documents and policies 1768-1975*
London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975

Q. Bell *The Schools of Design*
London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963

A. Briggs *Victorian Cities*
London; Odhams Books Limited, 1963

H. Brigstocke (Ed) *The Oxford Companion to Western Art*
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

R. Carline *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art*
London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1968.

N. Carrington *Design in a Changing Civilisation*
London: John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd, 1935.

B. Denvir *The Early Nineteenth Century: Art, Design and Society 1789-1852*
London: Longman, 1984.

B. Denvir *The Late Victorians: Art, Design and Society 1852-1910*
London: Longman, 1986.

C. Edwards *Twentieth-Century Furniture: Materials, Manufacture and Markets*
Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

P. Evans & P. Doyle *The 1940s Home*
Oxford: Shire Publications, 2009

M. Farr *Design in British Industry: A Mid-Century Survey*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955

C. Frayling *The Royal College of Art: One hundred and fifty years of art and design*
London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987

A. Forty *Objects of Desire: Design and Society since 1750*
London: Thames & Hudson, 1995

J. Gloag (Ed) *Design in Modern Life*
London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1946

J. Gloag *Industrial Art Explained*
London: George Allen & Unwin, 1934

J. Gloag *Plastics and Industrial Design*

London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1945

JM. Guy *The Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*
London: Routledge, 1998

C. Harvie *et al* (Eds) *Industrialisation and Culture 1830-1914*
Basingstoke: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970

E. Hobsbawm *Industry and Empire*
London: Penguin, 1999 (revised edition)

H. Hoock *The King's Artists: The Royal Academy of Arts and the Politics of British Culture 1760-1840*
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2003

E. Hopkins *Birmingham: The First Manufacturing Town in the World 1760 – 1840*
London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989

S. Hutchison *The History of the Royal Academy 1768 – 1986*
London: Robert Royce Ltd, 1986.

F. MacCarthy *All Things Bright and Beautiful: Design in Britain 1830 to Today*
London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1972.

S. Macdonald *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art*
Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2005.

S. Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*
London: University of London Press, 1970.

J. Mills *Utility Furniture: the 1943 Utility Furniture Catalogue with an explanation of Britain's Second World War Utility Furniture Scheme*
Sevenoaks: Sabrestorm Publishing, 2008

JL. Oliver *The Development and Structure of the Furniture Industry*
Oxford & London: Pergamon Press, 1966.

N. Pevnser *Academies of Art Past and Present*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

N. Pevsner *Industrial Art in England*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937 (2010 edition).

N. Pevsner *Pioneers of Modern Design*
London: Penguin, 1975

M. Pilkington *Past, present and future: A history of Buckinghamshire Chilterns New University*
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University, 2010.

D. Piper (Ed) *Dictionary of Art and Artists*
London: Collins, 1988.

H. Read *Art and Industry: The Principles of Industrial Design*
London: Faber & Faber Ltd, 1934.

G. Russell *The Things We See: Furniture*
Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1953

J. Reynolds (Ed. R. Wark) *Discourse on Art*
New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997.

W. Sandby *The History of The Royal Academy of Arts: from its Foundation to the Present Time vol. 1.*
London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green, 1862.

P. Sparke *Consultant Design: The history and practice of the designer in industry*
London: Pembridge Press, 1983

P. Sparke *Furniture*
London: Bell & Hyman Ltd, 1986

R. Stewart *Design and British Industry*
London: John Murray, 1987

R. Strand *A Good Deal of Freedom: Art & Design in the Public Sector of Higher Education 1960-1982*
Council for National Academic Awards, 1987

G. Sutton *Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools*
London: Pergamon Press, 1967.

R. Sword (Ed) *CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951*
London: Geffrye Museum Trust, 1995

D. Thompson *England in the Nineteenth Century; 1815 – 1914*
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1983.

M. Tight *The Development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945* Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education / Open University Press, 2009.

B. Tilson (Ed) *Made in Birmingham: Design and Industry 1889-1989*

*S*tudley, KAF Brewin Books, 1989.

WT. Whitley *Artists and Their Friends in England 1700 – 1799: vol. I* London: The Medici Society, 1928.

WT. Whitley *Artists and Their Friends in England 1700 – 1799: vol. II* London: The Medici Society, 1928.

AN. Wilson *The Victorians* London: Arrow Books, 2003.

Articles and chapters in books

T. Barlowe 'The Council of Industrial Design' *Design '46: Survey of British Industrial Design as Displayed at the 'Britain Can Make It' Exhibition* London: Council of Industrial Design & HMSO, 1946.

M. Black 'The Education of Industrial Designers – I: The Past and Present' *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* 113:5111 (1965 Oct), pp. 850-866.

R. Bourne 'Still at square one' *Design* 265: Jan 1971 pp. 44-46

R. Darwin 'Designers in the making' *Design '46: Survey of British Industrial Design as Displayed at the 'Britain Can Make It' Exhibition* London: Council of Industrial Design & HMSO, 1946.

R. Darwin 'The Dodo and the Phoenix: The Royal College of Art since the War' *Royal Society of Arts, Journal* 102:4918 (1954: Feb5) pp. 174-188.

R. Darwin 'The Training of the Industrial Designer' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 97:4794 (1949: May 6) pp.421-436.

JE. Eyestone 'The Influence of Swedish Sloyd and its Interpreters on American Art Education' in *Studies in Art Education* vol. 34, No.1 (Autumn, 1992), pp. 28-38.

E. Gibney 'Robbins: 50 years later' *Times Higher Education* 24/10/2103 http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/robbins-50-years-later/2008287.article

G. Hawtin *A Century of Progress: The Story of the Leicester Secular Society*, 1972. http://leicestersecularsociety.org.uk

C. Holme (Ed) 'Arts and Crafts: A Review of Work executed by the Students in the leading Art Schools of Great Britain and Ireland' *The Studio* London, 1916.

K. Holmes ‘Co-operation between manufacturers and art schools’ *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* vol. 85, no 4409 (May 21st, 1937) pp. 628-645.

L. Julius ‘The Furniture Industry’ *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* May 1967, pp. 430-447.

J. Kelly ‘The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and Identity in the British Enlightenment’, Review by McMurren MH in *Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 74, No 1 (March 2011). pp. 140-144.

C. Kisby ‘The Future Designer – from Elementary School to College’ *Royal Society of Arts Journal* 86:4457 (1938: April 22) pp. 552-566.

MH. McMurren Review of Kelly, J ‘The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and Identity in the British Enlightenment’ *Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 74, No 1 (March 2011). pp. 140-144.

D. Queensbury ‘The Designer, the Craftsman and the Manufacturer’ *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* 124:5234 (1976: Jan) pp. 87-96.

M. Quinn ‘The Political Economic Necessity of the Art School, 1835-52’ *International Journal of Art and Design Education* vol. 30, issue 1 (February 2011). pp. 62-70.

A. Rifkin ‘Success Disavowed: The Schools of Design in Mid-Nineteenth – Century Britain (An Allegory)’ *Journal of Design History* vol. 1. No.2 (1988) pp. 89-102.

M. Romans ‘Living in the Past: Some Revisionist Thoughts on the Historiography of Art and Design Education’ *International Journal of Art and Design Education* Vol. 23, issue 3 (October 2004). pp. 270 – 277.

M. Romans ‘A Question of ‘Taste’: Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century’ in Romans, M (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005.

G. Russell ‘Modern Trends in Industrial Design’ *Journal, Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce,* July 1960. pp. 565-595.

K. Schott ‘Economic Competitiveness and Design’ *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Art, Manufactures and Commerce* 132:5338 (Sept 1984). pp. 648-659.

PAC. Sproll ‘Matters of Taste and Matters of Commerce: British Government Intervention in Art Education, 1835’. *Studies in Art Education* Vol. 35, No.2. (Winter 1994). pp. 105-113.

J. Swift ‘Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800-1921’ in Romans, M (Ed) *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005.

J. Swift ‘Birmingham Art Schools: Its Branch Schools and Female Students 1880-1900’ in Tilson, B (Ed) *Made in Birmingham: Design and Industry 1889-1989* Studley: KAF Brewin Books, 1989.

G. Walden ‘Designing our Future: the Response of the Education System to the Challenge of Design’. *Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Journal* 134:5357 (1986:Apr.) pp.229-310.

Websites

www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/archives/pages_collections/schoolofart.php

http://www.britannica.com

http://creative-blueprint.co.uk/statistics/reports/national-statistics

http://www.designmuseum.org/design/robin-lucienne-day

http://gimson.leicester.gov.uk

www.gracesguide.co.uk

http://www.ifacca.org/publications/2005/11/01/dti-economics-paper-no-15-creativity/

http://infed.org

http://leicestersecularsociety.org.uk

http://www.mishablackawards.org.uk/

http://www.parliament.uk

http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk/marketing/index.jsp

http://static.mimaterials.com/mimaterials/documents/MI%20Materials%20History%20Booklet.Dec09pdf.pdf p.12.
http://www.tate.org.uk

http://www.turnersociety.org.uk/Turner_biography.pdf

www.ucas.com/data-analysis/data-resources/data-tables/he-subject

http://www.20thcenturylondon.org.uk/black-sir-misha